



**South Mountain Corridor Study
Citizens Advisory Team
Meeting Summary**

Date: June 11, 2013
Time: 6 p.m.
Location: South Mountain Community College

SMCAT Members Attending:

Ahwatukee Foothills Chamber of Commerce, Karen Starbowski
 Arizona Public Health Association, Al Brown
 AZ Forward, Charles Horvath
 Calabrea HOA, Mike Buzinski
 City of Avondale, Bryan Kilgore
 Cottonfields Community HOA, Timmothy Stone
 Estrella Village Planning Committee, Peggy Eastburn
 Foothills Club West HOA, Michael Hinz
 Foothills Reserve HOA, Derrick Denis
 Lakewood HOA, Chris Boettcher
 Laveen Village Planning Committee, Wes Lines
 Maricopa County Farm Bureau, Clayton Danzeisen
 Phoenix Mountains Preservation Council, Michael Goodman
 Sierra Club, for Sandy Bahr
 The Foothills HOA, Chad Blostone

SMCAT Members Absent:

Ahwatukee Village Planning Committee, Melanie Beauchamp
 Arlington Estates HOA, Camilo Acosta
 Gila River Indian Community – District 4, LaQuinta Allison
 Laveen Citizens for Responsible Development, Laurie Prendergast
 Mountain Park Ranch HOA, Jim Welch
 Pecos Road/I-10 Landowners Association, Nathaniel Percharo
 Silverado Ranch, Eric Baim
 South Mountain Village Planning Committee, Tamala Daniels
 Southwest Valley Chamber of Commerce, Woody Thomas

Staff and Consultants:

Carmelo Acevedo, ADOT	Alan Hansen, FHWA	Scott Stapp, HDR
Darcy Anderson, ADOT	Rebecca Yedlin, FHWA	Jack Allen, Jacobs
Brock Barnhart, ADOT	Bob Hazlett, MAG	Heather Honsberger, Jacobs
Brent Cain, ADOT	Nathan Pryor, MAG	Fred Erickson, KCA
Ralph Ellis, ADOT	Kelly Taft, MAG	Tom Keller, KCA
Richard Erickson, ADOT	Dorothy Bungert, HDR	David Pekara, VSI
Chau Hill, ADOT	Terry Gruver, HDR	
Reggie Rector, ADOT	Ben Spargo, HDR	

Citizens:

Allison Hurtado
Ariel LeBamon

Scott Sprague
Tiffany Sprague

Agenda:

Agenda Item	Facilitator / Speaker
1. Welcome and Introductions	Tom Keller, KCA
2. SMCAT Operating Agreement Review	Tom Keller, KCA
3. Draft EIS Review	Ben Spargo, HDR; Scott Stapp, HDR
4. Draft EIS Open Discussion	Tom Keller, KCA; Study Team Members
5. SMCAT Recommendation Process	Tom Keller, KCA
6. Questions from Public	Tom Keller, KCA

Loop 202 South Mountain Freeway Study
Citizens Advisory Team Meeting
Draft EIS Review Meeting

June 11, 2013

6:00 p.m.

South Mountain Community College
7050 South 24th Street
Phoenix, Arizona

REPORTED BY:

Robin L. B. Osterode, RPR, CSR

AZ Certified Reporter No. 50695

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

FACILITATORS:

Tom Keller
Fred Erikson

SMCAT Membership:

Karen Starbowski, Ahwatukee Foothills Chamber
of Commerce
Melanie Beauchamp, Ahwatukee Village Planning
Committee
Camilo Acosta, Arlington Estates HOA
Charles Horvath, AZ Forward
Al Brown, AZ Public Health Association
Mike Buzinski, Calabrea HOA
Bryan Kilgore, City of Avondale
Timothy Stone, Cottonfields/Bougainvillea
Community HOA
Peggy Eastburn, Estrella Village Planning
Committee
Michael Hinz, Foothills Club West HOA
Derrick Denis, Foothills Reserve HOA
LaQuinta Allison, Gila River Indian Community -
District 4
Chris Boettcher, Lakewood HOA
Laurie Prendergast, Laveen Citizens for
Responsible Development
Wes Lines, Laveen Village Planning Committee
Clayton Danzeisen, Maricopa County Farm Bureau
Jim Welch, Mountain Park Ranch HOA
Nathaniel Percharo, Pecos Road/I-10 Landowners
Association
Michael Goodman, Phoenix Mountains Preservation
Council
Sandy Bahr, Sierra Club
Eric Baim, Silverado Ranch
Tamala Daniels, South Mountain Village Planning
Committee
Woody Thomas, Southwest Valley Chamber of
Commerce
Chad Blostone, The Foothills HOA

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

PROCEEDINGS

THE FACILITATOR: Good evening, everyone. We'll be giving it about five minutes; we have a few folks still signing in. I understand that the I-10 and Baseline crash that was there earlier is cleared up, so if anybody was going to be in that, they'll just be making it. So thank you.

Good evening, everyone. Welcome to the Loop 202 South Mountain Citizens Advisory Team Meeting. I'd like to welcome you all to this evening's meeting. For those of you who are new to this event, the folks sitting around this table here represent organizations throughout the study area. And this is their official meeting.

Do we have a motion to call the meeting to order?

CAT MEMBER: Move to open.

THE FACILITATOR: Moved.

CAT MEMBER: Second.

THE FACILITATOR: Second, thank you. All in favor.

CAT MEMBERS: Aye.

THE FACILITATOR: It appears, if my math is correct, that we have a quorum, so we are an

1 official meeting. The purpose of tonight's meeting
2 is to review the EIS, have an open discussion on the
3 draft, to have a recommendation process outline for
4 our agreement, and to take questions from the public
5 and adjourn.

6 Those of you who have -- Fred, if you
7 take me to the agenda -- this is the process we will
8 follow tonight. We'll try to stick to this time
9 line. We have a 6:00 to 8:00 time frame, hopefully
10 we can accomplish our business in that time.

11 For those of you who are -- CAT Members,
12 as always, at your desk is a packet of information at
13 your desk that we provided for you, as well as the
14 meeting forms that we ask you to complete at the end.
15 Members of the public, there are blue cards at the
16 table back there, and should you want to ask
17 questions at the appropriate time under "questions
18 from the public" on the agenda, please fill out the
19 cards and bring them to me or raise your hand and
20 throughout the evening I'll come pick them up. And
21 at the appropriate time to address these questions,
22 I'll read your question and we'll do our best to
23 answer your question for you, as time allows. If a
24 question doesn't get answered during the evening, we
25 normally get those responded to within, what time

1 frame?

2 MR. SPARGO: We'll go through it.

3 THE FACILITATOR: Okay. Ben's going to
4 go through that process.

5 The folks along the wall here represent
6 the study team, they represent ADOT, and they
7 represent the Federal Highway Administration. These
8 are the folks that have been working on this project
9 for some time, and as you can see, every chair is
10 taken, so thank you for joining us tonight. Ben
11 Spargo is sitting right up here and he will lead the
12 discussion in a few minutes, and the process we'll go
13 through is as you have questions, Ben will either
14 answer the question or direct the question to one or
15 more of the folks sitting along the wall to try to
16 get your questions answered all on the same page.

17 Okay, let's begin. As is our common
18 practice, we have a review of the operating agreement
19 and our statement of purpose, the purpose of this
20 South Mountain Citizens Advisory Team is one purpose
21 really to study the process and to provide a
22 recommendation of build or no-build at the
23 conclusion. We are at a stage with this particular
24 team that following this meeting their organizations
25 will be providing that recommendation of build or

1 no-build, so we have come to the end of the process.
2 This activity is a voluntary team; it's not a
3 decision-making body, and it has a single purpose of
4 providing that recommendation of build or no-build.
5 We have established an operating agreement over time
6 among the members here to have a quorum, to follow
7 the process, treat each other with respect and
8 dignity throughout the process, and to your credit
9 we've been able to do that for the last many months.
10 So since this will probably be our last meeting,
11 let's try to hold onto that concept just one more
12 time and we'll be just fine.

13 Okay. Go ahead, Fred. Back up.

14 One more time, throughout the evening
15 we'll be working on the time schedule for the agenda.
16 Fred will keep time for us. If we start to exceed
17 any of the time frames, we'll ask your will to
18 determine whether we continue on with that discussion
19 in that area or move on to the next item and parking
20 lot that item. We'll enforce the standards of
21 behavior, and as always, go through the discuss,
22 debate, and recommend process. We welcome the
23 visitors and encourage you to ask questions through
24 the blue card format I was talking about earlier. We
25 will track any parking lot issues, and my guess is

1 given what we want to accomplish tonight and get out
2 of here at 8:00 or so, we probably won't take a
3 break. Can you handle two straight hours? Okay. If
4 it turns out we need to, let us know and we'll give
5 it a shot. Let's go through that again. I mentioned
6 the session feedback forms. Go ahead.

7 And at this point I'd like to introduce
8 Ben Spargo and Scott Stapp from HDR Engineering and
9 they're going to walk us through the draft
10 EIS review.

11 Ben.

12 MR. SPARGO: Thanks, Tom.

13 As Tom said, my name is Ben Spargo. I'm
14 the roadway and project lead for HDR Engineering.
15 Scott Stapp, who is the environmental lead, will be
16 assisting me during the presentation to go through
17 some of the environmental aspects. What we're --
18 what we've done with the agenda tonight is sort of
19 broken it up into two steps. The first step is going
20 to be more of a general overview of the draft EIS,
21 providing sort of information on what's in there, for
22 those of you that haven't really dug into it. We
23 also asked Tom and Fred to send out an e-mail prior
24 to this meeting, and solicited questions from the
25 CAT. We did get 25 questions from the members, and

1 throughout the overview we will touch on some of the
2 responses and questions that we received. What you
3 have in front of you should be the PowerPoint
4 presentation that we'll go through, as well as a
5 11 x 17 that lists the detailed responses for those
6 questions that we had received.

7 As we go through the PowerPoint, you will
8 see references to the questions, so you can follow
9 along and review any of those that you want. When we
10 get -- so the detailed answers to the questions are
11 in the handout; the presentation is more of an
12 overview of that. We do want to point out that all
13 the answers in the PowerPoint and any that are
14 provided verbally during the second part of the
15 evening should be considered draft in their nature.
16 We do want to, you know, sort of leave the opening,
17 just because of the process that we're in, this
18 90-day comment period that the real final responses
19 are not -- are not final until they're presented in
20 the final EIS, that way that they have been properly
21 view by all of the agencies as well as FHW's legal
22 department.

23 Also -- also, sort of a special case for
24 this group is that we will be incorporating all of
25 these questions into the Final EIS, so they -- so

1 they will be considered just the same as any comments
2 that would have been given at the public hearing or
3 any of the public forums or online through some of
4 the other areas, so in the Final EIS there will be a
5 designation or commenter that is generally a South
6 Mountain CAT member, and that's where you can find
7 sort of the final comments and responses.

8 So the following slides that I'm going to
9 go through are a representation of the information in
10 the Draft EIS. It's not a complete story. Really,
11 to get that, you have to dive into the document. We
12 did provide a number of documents spread along the
13 tables for you to use. If we do get into some of the
14 Q&A at the end, and we want to reference different
15 areas of the document, we want to provide those so
16 you can see where that information is in the Draft
17 EIS itself.

18 As I mentioned, the second part of the
19 evening where we have allotted another 40 minutes
20 will be more of a general open-discussion Q&A, where
21 we'll take questions from the CAT team, and we will
22 use the study team and myself to try to answer those
23 as best we can. A lot of the topics that we cover in
24 the presentation in the slides are going to be geared
25 towards what we heard from the CAT Members

1 themselves. They really touched on some of the key
2 things that we've heard throughout this process. And
3 for you and also for the public, also just want to
4 note that all this information, as well as all the
5 PDFs of the Draft EIS, the online public hearing, you
6 know, everything associated with this project is
7 available online at the
8 Azdot.gov/southmountainfreeway. It's a great
9 resource for the history of the CAT meetings
10 themselves, as well as all the new information that's
11 been put out during the 90-day period for the Draft
12 EIS.

13 With that, we'll jump right in to Chapter
14 1, which is the purpose and need. An early step is
15 really for the study team to determine if there's a
16 need, and in the comparison that's made in the
17 purpose and need is based on existing and future
18 conditions without any major investment in the study
19 area. The future conditions do, though, consider all
20 the other planned elements from city plans to MAG's
21 regional transportation plans, so it includes
22 widening of other facilities, other new freeways in
23 the region, as well as all the transit, light rail
24 expansion, so that's considered in our base condition
25 for future conditions that we look at.

1 By looking at that condition, if the
2 owner, ADOT/FHWA, determined that there is a
3 deficiency in the area that we're looking at, then
4 they would go to the second step, which is presented
5 in Chapter 3, which is the alternatives evaluation.
6 But the purpose and need really just makes the case
7 for the need for a major transportation facility in
8 the study area.

9 The purpose, as identified for the South
10 Mountain Freeway, is based on socioeconomic factors,
11 the amount of population, employment, jobs growth
12 that is projected in the southwest area of the
13 Phoenix metropolitan area, the purpose and need is
14 really developed based on using FHWA guidance. In
15 the purpose and need we don't get into, you know,
16 what or how we're going to solve that problem.

17 One of the questions in the -- from the
18 CAT Members dealt with, you know, the whole idea of
19 this being a bypass and when and where that was, you
20 know, determined as the purpose and need. The
21 purpose and need in the Draft EIS is really geared
22 towards defining the problem, not really getting into
23 the solutions.

24 Now, when we do get into Chapter 3 and
25 the solutions, we do identify that one of the

1 benefits of what is being recommended would be that
2 it would provide, you know, additional east/west
3 mobility and serve as an alternate route to I-10.
4 Something that was noted by a CAT Member as far as
5 the information that's presented in the purpose and
6 need is that the data does look at, at least on the
7 socioeconomic side, conditions from 2005 to 2035.
8 And the comment dealt with, you know, how do we take
9 into account what's occurred, you know, since 2005.
10 And, basically, the complete data set that we used
11 from 2005 is the most recent data available.

12 MAG is in the process right now and I
13 believe that regional council is set to adopt new
14 traffic and socio and economic projections coming up
15 at their June meeting, and this new information will
16 be used in the Final EIS to update the socioeconomic
17 information that's presented in the document.

18 Now, as possible, in Chapter 4 in the
19 environmental section, we did use 2010 census
20 information for items such as social conditions and
21 environmental justice, so where we needed the
22 information, we did use the more updated population
23 and information. Now, the traffic information that's
24 presented in Chapter 1 and Chapter 3 is based on
25 information obtained from the MAG Regional

1 Transportation demand model. This model is state of
2 the art, you know, it's one of the best models in the
3 nation, and it's basically used for all
4 transportation planning in Maricopa County and even
5 into parts of Pinal County.

6 So all the cities in the region, as well
7 as ADOT, use this model to make their transportation
8 and infrastructure investments and plans for the
9 future. And this makes things very consistent so
10 that everybody is using the same information. Also,
11 it does provide information related to all modes, and
12 does capture -- MAG does a number of studies
13 throughout the year and continuously looking at
14 different impacts, you know, from the trucking
15 industry, how to take into account airport traffic,
16 external traffic for people that are commuting in
17 from areas outside of the Phoenix metropolitan area.
18 They do studies to account for all of that
19 information and continually update their model.

20 Now, something to note with the 2035
21 conditions is that they do include, you know, as I
22 mentioned, all of the other RTP facilities, so keep
23 that in mind when we're talking about the future
24 conditions with or without the South Mountain
25 Freeway, but within the purpose and need section, all

1 of those other improvements and investments into
2 transit and HOV lanes and other freeways and arterial
3 improvements, those are all included in the modeling.

4 Chapter 2 of the document covers Gila
5 River Indian Community coordination; it outlines sort
6 of all the meetings that have taken place throughout
7 the history of the project, really the conclusion to
8 that chapter, you know, is that, based on where we're
9 at today, with the community coordination and the
10 actions taken by the community and their members,
11 that ADOT and FHWA have determined that an
12 alternative alignment on community land is not
13 feasible. That's really where we're at today in the
14 process.

15 Chapter 3 -- after Chapter 1, you know,
16 we determined and put forth the reasons for a purpose
17 and need, and Chapter 3 kicks off the look at
18 alternatives development and screening, wherein in
19 the graphic here it's sort of shaped like a funnel
20 where we start with all the alternatives possible,
21 looking at different modes, selecting the mode that
22 best meets that need, and then going into and
23 identify alternatives and refining those alternatives
24 into the identification of a preferred alternative,
25 in this case the W-59 and E-1 alternatives.

1 Now, there was -- there is a lot of
2 discussion in the Draft EIS, you know, about
3 non-freeway, other modes in addition to freeways.
4 And the conclusion with regard to these is that
5 alone, and that's really the keyword here, is that
6 alone these alternatives would not be effective in
7 meeting the travel demand that's projected for the
8 study area.

9 Now, it doesn't mean that we're not going
10 to continue to support those; the regional
11 transportation plan, you know, has a lot of money
12 invested in the other modes, and this freeway would
13 be part of that plan and would support them even
14 further, providing HOV lanes and an HOV direct
15 connection in the West Valley; it would further
16 support more commuter-type transit uses for the
17 region.

18 Another question we had was in regard to
19 alternatives in the eastern section. So what this
20 map shows is all of the alternatives that were
21 considered early in the process that would connect --
22 either connect to the San Tan Freeway, similar to at
23 I-10, or that actually would stay north of the
24 mountain and avoid the mountain. And again, the
25 primary reason that these were eliminated, and this

1 is all presented in the Draft EIS, is that they would
2 have significant community impact and a lot of the
3 alternatives that extend U.S. 60 would go through
4 very dense residential and commercial areas, impact
5 thousands of homes and a number of businesses, and
6 then within the Ahwatukee area, really, the E-1
7 alternative represented the alternative that had the
8 least amount of community impacts, when compared to
9 the other ones that were looked at.

10 And again, it does summarize the fact
11 that, you know, at this time, there isn't, you know,
12 an alternative that avoids, you know, the mountain in
13 that area, because any of those alternatives to the
14 south would be on community land and the community
15 hasn't granted permission to study those
16 alternatives. Another topic that I know we've
17 touched on a number of times at these meetings that
18 was also commented on, so we'll sort of go to it, and
19 that is depressing the freeway. And, primarily, the
20 comment is why can't we depress the freeway through
21 the Pecos Road section? Which would be great if we
22 could, some of the aspects that we've identified
23 throughout the history and presented to this group is
24 that the topography of the area and having the
25 mountain just to the north and all of the water

1 flowing from the north/south across the freeway and
2 onto the Gila River Indian Community, you know, made
3 it very difficult to do a depressed freeway just
4 based on the fact that you're more or less, you know,
5 digging a large ditch that all the water wants to get
6 into. So how do we -- how do we mitigate that and
7 keep the freeway safe from flooding?

8 And what that would require is a number
9 of pump stations, very large drainage basins north of
10 the freeway to collect that water and pump it under
11 the freeway and across. And, in turn, that would
12 turn into more residential impacts, more right-of-way
13 acquisition, greater cost to acquire that
14 right-of-way, continually run the pump stations, and
15 what's summarized here is some of those impacts and a
16 comparison between the at-grade rolling profile in
17 the Draft EIS versus the depressed profile. About
18 150 additional acres of land, 150 to 300 additional
19 homes, and almost \$470 million of additional costs.
20 That's mainly the reason all those factors combined
21 by ADOT and FHWA has decided to move forward with an
22 at-grade rolling profile through this area.

23 Another item is the discussion of a
24 no-action alternative. By identifying the W-59 and
25 E-1 alternatives as the preferred alternative, you

1 know, ADOT and FHWA have eliminated the no-action
2 alternative as from the -- from their -- it's not
3 their preferred alternative. And some of the reasons
4 why is based on just the additional transportation
5 impacts, what's identified in the little graphic
6 talks about added travel time. A lot of that
7 discussion is in the economic section where we looked
8 at delays with and without the freeway, and then also
9 identified travelers like a dollar figure for your
10 time stuck in traffic if the freeway's not there and
11 then quantify that based on an annual basis.

12 Also, in Chapter 3, it discusses just the
13 overall traffic distribution in the study area and
14 surrounding areas, and shows that with the freeway,
15 almost 300,000 vehicles per day would be removed from
16 the arterial system, which would mean that the cities
17 and local jurisdictions would have to invest much
18 less, you know, in their systems. It would relieve a
19 lot of the local traffic that's just trying to go
20 from their home to the shopping or to schools,
21 because all of that regional traffic would be on the
22 freeway instead of on Baseline Road, Broadway Road,
23 and some of the other arterials.

24 And then in the energy section of Chapter
25 4 it also discusses energy use with and without the

1 freeway. And again, the freeway provides less delay,
2 greater speeds, which in turn results in less energy
3 use from a fuel consumption standpoint.

4 The right-of-way for the freeway is
5 generally in the neighborhood of 500 feet wide. We'd
6 be constructing three general purpose lanes and an
7 HOV lane in each direction for a total of eight
8 lanes, and all of that would be constructed at one
9 time. The right-of-way width is fairly similar to
10 other loop freeways in the valley, as well as I-10.
11 Most freeways are in the 350 to 500 feet wide, you
12 know, it varies depending on the drainage channel
13 width and other topography features that you're
14 running into.

15 Chapter 3 goes into a lot of detail about
16 the traffic, you know, on the freeway itself,
17 provides information on, you know, the comparison
18 between or among the action alternatives, as well as
19 on regional arterial and freeway facilities with any
20 of the action alternatives or the no-action in place,
21 and mainly, all of the action alternatives provide
22 similar operational benefits when compared to the
23 no-action alternative.

24 And the projected volumes on the freeway
25 itself would be very similar to what's experienced

1 today on other segments of Loop 101 and Loop 202 and
2 the other regional freeways.

3 All right. So, I do want to touch on
4 Canamex. And the last thing I want to touch on is
5 Canamex and trucking, in general. It's a comment
6 that we hear a lot is that, you know, this is going
7 to be part of Canamex, it's just going to serve
8 trucks, and I really just want to go through some of
9 the information that we present in the Draft EIS in
10 contradiction to those statements.

11 The first statement or at the top does
12 show the definition of Canamex. This is based on the
13 congressional definition from 1995, which is fairly
14 broad in identifying, you know, I-10 or I-19 from
15 Nogales to Tucson, I-10 from Tucson to Phoenix, and
16 U.S. 93 in the vicinity of Phoenix to Las Vegas or to
17 the Nevada border. And the definition is fairly
18 broad, and that gives -- gave the local and state and
19 regional agencies an opportunity to further define
20 that within their region.

21 And the map shows what MAG and ADOT or
22 MAG adopted in partnership with ADOT to define the
23 Canamex corridor in Maricopa County. And how they
24 defined it that it would come up I-10 from Tucson and
25 go on to I-8 west in the area of Gila Bend, where it

1 would connect to State Route 85 and continue north to
2 I-10. And then at I-10, go further west to
3 Wickenburg Road, Vulture Mine Road, up to Wickenburg,
4 where it would potentially use the Wickenburg bypass,
5 which is under study or in different areas of
6 development, and continue along U.S. 93 up to the
7 Nevada border.

8 Now, another point is that map 21, in
9 July of this past year, also adopted the Interstate
10 11 corridor, which would provide a further bypass of
11 the Phoenix metropolitan area, and would be
12 incorporated into the Canamex corridor at that time.
13 So all of this is just trying to support that really
14 the purpose of the Canamex corridor is to bypass the
15 Phoenix metropolitan area completely, and this is the
16 adopted route, as adopted by MAG in coordination with
17 ADOT as of April of 2001.

18 Now, further, with regard to other
19 trucks, the designated and signed bypass for the
20 Phoenix metropolitan area, there are signs at both
21 ends of this corridor, it is SR 85 and Interstate 8,
22 similar to the Canamex Road.

23 Now, we do understand that like other
24 freeways in the region, trucks are going to use the
25 South Mountain Freeway, as a normal business avenue.

1 And we project, based on the travel demand model and
2 the information, that there would be about 10 percent
3 of the total traffic on the freeway would be heavy
4 vehicles.

5 Now, I should note that in order to come
6 into and use the South Mountain Freeway, that would
7 require trucks to enter the metropolitan area and
8 come into some, you know, heavily congested, you
9 know, areas. So trucks that are really through
10 trucks, not doing business, you know, in the Phoenix
11 metropolitan area, they would typically use that I-8
12 and SR 85 bypass of the area, because, although the
13 South Mountain Freeway provides an alternate route to
14 I-10 through downtown Phoenix, it still requires you
15 to travel along a lot of congested freeways within
16 the metropolitan area, areas that are going to
17 continue to receive increased traffic from all of the
18 new people, houses, and jobs that are coming to the
19 area.

20 All right. With that, I am going to hand
21 it over to Scott to go through Chapter 4 and Chapter
22 5.

23 MR. STAPP: Thanks, Ben. Anyway, Chapter
24 4 is -- discusses the affected environment. And what
25 we're talking about there are the potential impacts

1 on the social, economic, and environmental setting
2 that would be caused by either the action alternative
3 or the no-action alternative, the no-build
4 alternative. It also presents mitigation or actions
5 taken that would reduce, minimize impacts to those
6 resources as we go through, during construction,
7 operation or maintenance of the facility.

8 And one kind of caution that I want to
9 throw out is that Chapter 4 should really be reviewed
10 in its entirety, because what's happening, I noticed
11 this a lot during the public hearing and talking to
12 people, for example, they focused on a particular
13 issue, they focused on biology, they focused on
14 Hazmat, whatever it was, but they didn't read the
15 rest of the document. The document, there's a lot of
16 interrelated things through Chapter 4 that basically
17 will make sense as we go through, and I think that
18 I'll hit on a couple of those as I go.

19 Which button is it? All right.

20 So the first thing, again related to a
21 question that came in, was displacements mitigation.
22 And again, to acquire property, we are required to
23 follow, and ADOT does follow, the Uniform Relocation
24 Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies
25 Act. And also Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of

1 1964.

2 And basically, in -- if access to a local
3 property is removed, ADOT is required, if possible,
4 to provide reasonable access to those properties. In
5 addition, it's also important to note, that these
6 negotiations would be with individual property owners
7 and would be on a case-by-case basis. And again,
8 what we recommend is if you do have additional
9 questions on individual properties, to get with ADOT
10 right away, they would be happy to talk to you about
11 that.

12 The next one is on air quality, in that
13 section we talked about regulatory overview, criteria
14 pollutants, Mobile Source Air Toxics, environmental
15 consequences, and conclusions. One of which is
16 presented here, and that is that despite growth and
17 vehicle miles traveled over time, we've also seen
18 reduction in the number of -- in the pollutants that
19 are produced over that same period of time.

20 In response to a couple of questions,
21 there were some questions about some of the studies
22 that were cited, and thinking that those summaries of
23 the studies were incomplete, they are intended, by
24 the way, as summaries. NEPA asks that we keep down
25 unneeded -- unnecessary repetition, and again, to

1 basically give summaries where possible.

2 FHWA has not only reviewed those
3 summaries, for the most part they came up with them,
4 and those -- the summary of those reports is
5 presented in the Draft EIS and considered by FHWA to
6 be inclusive and satisfactory, because it actually
7 uses those same studies, those same summaries of
8 those studies in their interim guidance update on
9 Mobile Source Air Toxics.

10 Also, it was pointed out that on page
11 S-4, the statement regarding MSAT emissions stated
12 that increased traffic volumes could produce elevated
13 MSAT emissions near the proposed action. And, in
14 fact, we agree with that comment, and that was in
15 almost every place else in the document we said would
16 produce elevated MSAT emissions or would produce
17 those things.

18 So we agree with that comment and one
19 thing to note is that between the Draft EIS and the
20 Final EIS, a lot of the wording will change. In that
21 we use the word "would" a lot in the Draft EIS. I'm
22 sure you noticed that as you went through.

23 In the Final EIS most of those woulds
24 will be changed to will. So what we're proposing
25 here is a wording change on that particular issue to

1 say that increase traffic volumes will produce
2 elevated MSAT emissions near the proposed action.

3 Again, following up on the Mobile Source
4 Air Toxics, questions related to specific health
5 impacts. And as we got into a lot of detail of that,
6 on page 469 of the Draft EIS, FHWA basically does not
7 feel as though it -- we have enough information to
8 reliably and credibly predict project-specific health
9 impacts attributable to changes in MSAT emissions
10 related to the alternatives that we're looking at,
11 and because that information is incomplete. It's
12 incomplete because, again, total exposure to MSAT
13 emissions is an exposure from all sources, not just
14 the emissions coming out of the tailpipe.

15 There are also uncertainties associated
16 with both the emissions and the dispersion models
17 that are used. There's a lack of national agreement
18 on the air dose response values. It's unclear how to
19 determine lifetime exposures. And again, that's over
20 approximately a 70-year period. And also, there's no
21 national consensus on what acceptable risk really is
22 to people. A number of questions were asked about
23 monitoring sites and emission trends. That really
24 didn't come out of the Draft EIS, but they were more
25 related to that air quality forum that was put on a

1 few weeks ago, and we wanted to hit some of those as
2 well.

3 One of the questions was the closest
4 monitoring site to Ahwatukee, which is actually the
5 West Chandler monitor. It's important to note, too,
6 that not all monitors measure or monitor all the
7 pollutants that we're talking about. The west
8 Chandler monitor does collect information on
9 meteorological conditions, ozone, CO, and PM-10.
10 Another question was asked about how about on the
11 Gila River Indian Community, and they do have a
12 monitoring site at the St. John's School, but that
13 only contains meteorologic conditions and ozone.

14 As far as the emission trends, you may
15 remember that a trend was shown, a trend short was
16 shown at 65 miles per hour and how emissions factors
17 are going the other direction, talking to you, how
18 those emission factors went down over time. The
19 questions were what were those based on, and again,
20 the answer is they were average emission rates per
21 vehicle based on all vehicle types in the Maricopa
22 County area.

23 A follow-up question to that came in and
24 that was how about if we reduce those speeds down to
25 about 25, would we see the same trends, and the

1 answer is yes. You see those same emission trends at
2 the lower speeds.

3 Questions raised on noise, again, the
4 noise impact of the freeway on these noise-sensitive
5 land uses, mostly residences, was determined
6 according to the ADOT noise abatement policy, and one
7 thing to emphasize is that those will be refined as
8 design proceeds. So the more exact we get in design,
9 then those noise studies will be run again.

10 One question came up is why, for example,
11 were the noise levels at I-10 and 59 tended to be
12 lower than what you would expect. Well, again, the
13 models actually reflect what the existing conditions
14 are out there today. And because there are existing
15 noise barriers in the that area, then again, those
16 barriers are reflected in the modeling that's done.

17 The other question on noise was the South
18 Mountain Park and Preserve. It was evaluated,
19 according to ADOT's noise abatement policy, so you
20 know, that was considered in the analysis. As far as
21 water resources, we did look at surface water,
22 irrigation, canals, access to groundwater supply, and
23 one of the questions is, again, how do we know that
24 we can replace that well, in the -- the Foothills
25 well. And basically after -- after looking at data

1 from the Arizona Department of Water Resources, U.S.
2 Geological Survey, and we could not find a reason
3 that a replacement well location couldn't be found
4 that would supply that water.

5 However, we also spent a lot of time in
6 the Draft EIS on 4-100 talking about what happens if
7 we can't. So again, ADOT is required to provide an
8 alternative source of water, and those are described
9 in great detail in that section.

10 For biological resources, we looked at a
11 lot of wildlife and plant species protected through
12 various state, federal laws, and regulations, western
13 section. Again, we came up with there were no
14 impacts to -- there were no effects to threatened and
15 endangered species in the west. In the east it was
16 pointed out that, again, we do have the Sonoran
17 Desert Tortoise, which is a candidate species. And
18 we do mention that there would be effects on that
19 species from vehicle conflicts, displacement, loss of
20 habitat, so on and so forth. So for mitigation for
21 that, for the tortoise in particular, that mitigation
22 would include, but not be limited to, additional
23 coordination with Fish and Wildlife -- Game & Fish to
24 determine whether, in fact, additional mitigation
25 would be required, drainage structures through the

1 South Mountain Park and Preserve would be designed to
2 accommodate multi-functional crossings.

3 And again, this is one of those areas
4 that came up in the Draft EIS. If you were focused
5 entirely on biology and you talked about the
6 multi-use crossings, it's important to note that
7 those crossings not only serve wildlife, but they
8 serve people, and that's really what we were getting
9 at in that. In other words, we're trying to maintain
10 that connection between the Gila River Indian
11 Community, in particular, and the South Mountains.
12 So both of those issues are considered, and that's
13 why they're called multiuse crossings. Also,
14 educating construction personnel of guidelines for
15 the desert tortoises here.

16 As far as cultural resources, we did
17 spend a lot of time on looking at cultural resources
18 in the area, again, those resources that do qualify
19 for the National Register of Historic Places,
20 generally, also including places of traditional
21 religious, and cultural significance. And it was --
22 I think one of the questions was why didn't we look
23 at the cultural impacts to the South Mountain Park
24 and Preserve. And basically throughout chapter --
25 throughout the chapter, Chapter 4, we have talked

1 about the impacts on South Mountain Park and Preserve
2 in a number of different places. This is a listing
3 of a few of them, and then in addition they were
4 covered pretty extensively in Chapter 5 where we talk
5 about Section 4(f) impact.

6 Hazardous materials was the source of
7 another question. Again, under the plan as we go
8 forward, the transport of hazardous cargo is expected
9 to be permissible on this facility. What we've
10 stated in the document is that emergency responders
11 would address the construction operation of the
12 proposed freeway by amending the local emergency
13 response plan to include the freeway. And that would
14 include emergency response on the freeway, and
15 alternative routes for the diversion of traffic in
16 the event that a hazardous material incident occurred
17 along the freeway.

18 One of the other things, again, this is
19 another one where you had to go to another section of
20 Chapter 4 to find it, is what happens if there's a
21 spill. And in the water resources section, we talked
22 about the fact that the drainage facilities along the
23 proposed freeway would be designed to also function
24 as chemical spill containment structures if that
25 occurred.

1 Visual resources was the, again, the
2 source of another question. We did look at visual
3 character throughout the entire study area, and
4 again, one of those specific questions was why didn't
5 we consider visual impacts to South Mountain Park and
6 Preserve. And again, we did, if you look at
7 basically several parks through, we did look at many
8 impacts to the park and preserve. And, in fact,
9 those photos were taken from the National Trail
10 towards where the freeway would be.

11 And as you can see in the top photo,
12 towards the western end, the freeway would not be
13 visible. In the one to the far west, where you can
14 look down and see, which is probably pretty hard to
15 see in this slide, but anyway, that is the casino in
16 the background. So chances are you could also see a
17 freeway facility in that as well.

18 Chapter 5, again, talks about the Section
19 4(f) evaluation. Again, covered under the Section
20 4(f) of the Department of Transportation Act, and
21 basically it states that highway planners and
22 designers must demonstrate their prudent and feasible
23 alternatives for allowing a highway project to impact
24 a Section 4(f) resource. What's a Section 4(f)
25 resource, recreational trails, parks, and those types

1 of things.

2 So again, what mitigation are we offering
3 for the South Mountains, it would be -- it would
4 include, but again not be limited to, establishing
5 slope treatment plans for the cuts through the ridge
6 lines to make them blend more with the natural
7 setting. There would be ongoing consultation with
8 the Gila River Indian Community and other agencies
9 regarding the design and locations of those multiuse
10 crossings, some of those locations are tweaks, but
11 still it might be important.

12 And again, contracting with the Gila
13 River Indian Community so they themselves can perform
14 a full evaluation of traditional cultural properties
15 associated with the South Mountains. And again, in
16 response to another question, the City of Phoenix
17 would identify potential replacement recreational
18 land which would be provided for the use of the South
19 Mountain Park and Preserve.

20 MR. SPARGO: All right. Thank you. The
21 last chapter is Chapter 6, which summarizes comments
22 and coordination throughout the study process. It
23 includes a section that describes the South Mountain
24 CAT and meetings and different areas that the public
25 and this group have influenced the process throughout

1 the project.

2 One thing within this area I did just
3 want to kind of touch on is sort of the study's next
4 steps later in the -- in our meeting, we'll go
5 through some of the next steps for the CAT group
6 themselves. But with regard to the study itself, at
7 the top is release of the Draft EIS, which was April
8 26 of this year.

9 We're currently in the 90-day comment
10 period, which ends July 24th. During that period we
11 do note, you know, the public hearing, CAT
12 recommendation, and a number of community forums are
13 being held to solicit comments from the public. Once
14 the July 24th date is over, that's when the study
15 team will sort of hunker down and start going through
16 those comments, and start developing responses. So
17 that will take us through much of the end of the year
18 to get those created as well as reviewed by ADOT and
19 FHWA.

20 The current schedule as released of the
21 Final EIS in early 2014, the Final EIS will include,
22 you know, any of the data updates that we described
23 today, as well as the section with all of the
24 comments received and responses to those comments.
25 And there will be a 60-day review period for the

1 Final EIS where people will have an opportunity to
2 review the document, as well as their comments, to
3 ensure that they have been addressed.

4 Following the 60-day comment period, the
5 study team would -- would, you know, evaluate where
6 we're at in the process, and the plan would be to
7 submit the record of decision, which is really the
8 ultimate document, decision document, for the
9 project. And the current schedule would have that to
10 the public in mid-2014.

11 If -- if a build alternative is selected,
12 after the record of decision is published, that would
13 kick off more of the gearing up towards construction,
14 which would include property acquisition, and final
15 design. There is construction funding in ADOT's
16 five-year program in fiscal year 2015, which begins
17 July 1st of 2014.

18 So -- so at this point, you know, the
19 plan would be to get projects ready, you know, as
20 soon as possible after the record of decision, if a
21 build alternative is selected, and begin construction
22 as soon as mid- to late-2014.

23 All right. That concludes the initial
24 portion review of the Draft EIS. We're going to move
25 into an open discussion. I think Tom is going to

1 facilitate that for us.

2 THE FACILITATOR: Thank you, Ben and
3 Scott.

4 Those of you that are following along in
5 the agenda, we have just completed the Draft
6 EIS Review. This leads us to the open discussion for
7 the CAT Members, mostly seated at this table, and we
8 have --

9 Fred, if you take me to the next slide --
10 who's got the clicker?

11 MR. SPARGO: Sorry.

12 THE FACILITATOR: As I mentioned at the
13 outset of the meeting, along the wall is the study
14 team and Ben is going to be directing traffic to any
15 of the members along there who may be in the best
16 position to answer the question. I'll turn over the
17 mike to him to do so, and I'll manage the questions
18 that come from the team, and we'd like to follow the
19 process that if you have a question, we'll get your
20 question answered, and we'll try to get on to the
21 next person. If there isn't a person who has a next
22 question and you have another question to ask, we'll
23 take yours in that sequence. Try to get as many
24 people who have the opportunity to ask questions as
25 possible. So we'll try to manage that on that end

1 and, Ben, if you'll manage it on the other end, we'll
2 go ahead and get started.

3 Before we do, any comments and questions
4 on the next few minutes? Okay.

5 CAT MEMBER: What was that, Tom?

6 THE FACILITATOR: Are you okay with the
7 process we're going to go through? Okay, good. Ben,
8 I'm going to hand the microphone over to you.

9 THE FACILITATOR: Anyone have a --

10 MR. SPARGO: I was going to jump in and
11 cover, again, I wanted to again reiterate sort of the
12 process that we're going follow with the questions.
13 If there are questions that require further details
14 or any expertise that we don't have available
15 tonight, we do have the parking lot available for us
16 to table those questions to. What we're putting on
17 here is that we've kind of made the indication that
18 we would have all the questions that end up in the
19 parking lot, full responses, similar to what you
20 received today to those questions that were entered
21 prior to the meeting, by July 5th, that way that you
22 have an opportunity to get the questions answered, if
23 they, you know, are of importance to your
24 organization.

25 Again, the comments are, you know, should

1 be considered draft at this point, but we're going to
2 do our best to provide complete answers. We'd also
3 ask that you try to provide a very -- a detailed and
4 substantiate the concerns so that we can -- so we
5 have enough information to give you a complete
6 answer. As much as possible, we are probably going
7 to direct you to areas in the Draft EIS, where your
8 questions are answered for more information beyond
9 the answer that we provide you tonight.

10 THE FACILITATOR: And just one reminder
11 for the general public who are here, following the
12 questions from the South Mountain Citizens Advisory
13 Team, we have a short segment on recommendation
14 process and following that we will open questions to
15 the general public. And for those of you who plan on
16 asking a question, once again, there's blue cards
17 back there at the table by Terri, so please fill out
18 a card and let me have it, and I will make sure when
19 we get to that portion of the agenda, that we go
20 ahead and get your questions addressed.

21 Members of the Citizens Advisory Team?
22 Michael? Go ahead, Mike.

23 CAT MEMBER: Actually, I have two
24 questions. I gather I can only ask one at a time.

25 THE FACILITATOR: Well, if somebody else

1 isn't ready, we'll come back to you.

2 CAT MEMBER: I should be used to this
3 after 12 years, but I did submit a couple of
4 questions and basically you completely failed to
5 answer the questions, which seems to be the scope.
6 Just to zero in on part of the first question, it
7 actually, at the bottom, what you have as question 28
8 about the City of Phoenix will identify potential
9 replacement recreation land, what I was trying to
10 find out is if there is any federal law or any sort
11 of state law, whatever, that would require the
12 replacement land. I'm talking about South Mountain
13 Preserve. I gather there's about 30-some-odd acres
14 you're talking about taking, that the land that they
15 choose needs to be within the South Mountain area, or
16 would the city have the ability, say, to go buy more
17 land in the Sonoran Preserve area? Which to me would
18 not be mitigation.

19 MR. SPARGO: All right. We have to have
20 some people from ADOT Right-of-Way here. I don't
21 know if you guys have experienced that in other
22 areas.

23 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: We're dealing with
24 a project outside the Phoenix area right now that
25 deals with that potential problem. Right now with

1 that situation, we do have the option it can be
2 adjacent land or it can be land separated, but
3 adjacent to another recreational facility and will
4 just depend on the circumstance.

5 MR. SPARGO: Yeah, so I think just like
6 every private property owner that may be affected,
7 the City of Phoenix is going to be a group that is
8 going to be dealt with on a case-by-case basis.
9 We've indicated that those discussions would be with
10 the City Manager to determine, you know, what
11 replacement land where, how much, all of that will be
12 negotiated with ADOT and the City of Phoenix.

13 THE FACILITATOR: Go ahead.

14 By the way, Michael, don't let me forget
15 to come back to you for your second question.

16 CAT MEMBER: I have two or three
17 questions, but I'll just do one at a time. Will the
18 Federal Highway Administration and ADOT propose
19 mitigation measures to reduce harmful health impacts
20 from air pollution affecting nearby population
21 groups?

22 MR. SPARGO: And that's tied primarily to
23 air quality and all groups. Darcy, I don't know if
24 you want to -- if there's any legal -- legal areas
25 that -- or other projects where mitigation or

1 mitigation for air quality impacts -- I think the
2 question was geared towards identifying any
3 mitigation for health impacts due to increased, you
4 know, air quality or some of the MSAT

5 CAT MEMBER: I can elaborate on it if you
6 wish.

7 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: You're asking if
8 there's a federal law that would require that or are
9 you asking if there's any precedent for requiring
10 that?

11 CAT MEMBER: Does ADOT or Federal Highway
12 Administration plan to propose any mitigation
13 impacts, especially for the expected increase in
14 particulate emissions on nearby population groups?

15 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: At this point not
16 that I'm aware of?

17 CAT MEMBER: Okay.

18 THE FACILITATOR: Next question.

19 CAT MEMBER: I've got multiples like
20 everyone else, I suppose. The one on, I guess I'll
21 just pick one, on Canamex when you refer to MAG and
22 ADOT's choice for the Canamex route, so I understand
23 that you -- that MAG and ADOT prefer it to bypass and
24 go I-85, but the congressional designation isn't
25 that. I mean, it's I-10, there's a space in between

1 I-10 to get you to U.S. 93, why don't we
2 differentiate between those two in the report?

3 MR. SPARGO: Well, I mean, I think just
4 as we explained it, in that I think the discussion
5 was that, you know, the congressional definition is
6 fairly broad.

7 CAT MEMBER: It's not broad on I-10.
8 When you say "broad," and others have agreed with
9 this, so it's not just me making this up. I mean,
10 this is -- when you speak to some of the others that
11 have been involved with this stuff over time, they
12 will agree with you, that there's a gap between I-10
13 and U.S. 93. That's broad. So we don't know where
14 it's going to go in between that little area. Well,
15 I shouldn't say "little," in between that area.

16 But we do know that Congress said I-10
17 and U.S. 93. They didn't say I-8, I-85. And I-8,
18 I-85 gets you to I-10, so -- and the congressional
19 designation is I-10. So the gap of that, you know,
20 that vagueness that you're describing is outside of
21 I-8 and I-85.

22 MR. SPARGO: I understand. And we
23 discussed this at length in that, you know, in the,
24 you know, beyond, you know, what Congress, you know,
25 stated, you know, that MAG and that ADOT have

1 identified, you know, their preference for it.

2 CAT MEMBER: Preference, that's an
3 important statement that you just made, because that
4 is their preference for it. That's not what it is

5 MR. SPARGO: I don't know, is there any,
6 I guess -- I don't know if Alan or anybody --

7 CAT MEMBER: Alan would be a good one to
8 talk to, I think, because back East they see it a
9 little differently, I think.

10 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: You know, and
11 partially what we talk about is what is the intent of
12 Congress and Congress doesn't supply you with their
13 intent.

14 CAT MEMBER: No, they don't.

15 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: But what has
16 happened is the Congress has let the jurisdictions
17 designate what they think is the Canamex route, which
18 is what ADOT and MAG have done. They have designated
19 what they believe the Canamex route to be, which is
20 the I-8 and 85, and that's, you know, that stood for
21 quite some time. So I don't see that Congress is not
22 going to come and say, oh, no, you designated it
23 wrong. They leave their intent broad, so
24 jurisdictions and states can make decisions about
25 some of the individual pieces of that.

1 CAT MEMBER: But shouldn't you
2 distinguish between the two in the report? And the
3 reason I say that is because there's the statement
4 that the route would never be closer than 15 miles to
5 any of the proposed freeways, action alternatives.
6 Which that's correct, for I-8, I-85, which is, as Ben
7 stated, the preferred MAG and ADOT route, but that's
8 not the currently congressionally designated route;
9 the current designated route is I-10, so that
10 statement is not correct when you view what Congress
11 had currently has designated. And you can get it
12 changed just as you got I-11 added to U.S. 93, added
13 by Congress in map 21.

14 I think that's the intent when you say
15 they leave it broad for areas to determine it, sure,
16 they do, but you need to go back to them and get them
17 to designate it the way you want it to be. I mean,
18 the -- so shouldn't you -- shouldn't you distinguish
19 between that and the report, say, yeah, between what
20 MAG prefers and MAG and ADOT prefer and what is
21 currently designated. Because it doesn't -- that
22 statement, it doesn't, you know, is not correct.

23 MR. SPARGO: I think the response is that
24 we can look at adding -- it's not already in there --
25 the congressional definition of what it is, and then

1 sort of go through the same process that we provided
2 in the response to clearly show what, you know, what
3 Congress has designated.

4 CAT MEMBER: Well, is it within 15 miles?
5 Is the Canamex route within 15 miles of the action
6 alternative?

7 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I would say no,
8 because of the locals have identified the I-8, I-85
9 as the route in this area.

10 CAT MEMBER: How about with respect to
11 Congress's designation, is it within 15 miles of
12 Congress's designation?

13 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Well, again, I
14 mean, I -- I can read the definition the same broad
15 way, which is that Congress allows the states and
16 locals to make determination on some of the specifics
17 within it, and more focused on the broad thing, but
18 again, congressional intent is not provided on --

19 CAT MEMBER: No, but Congress's statement
20 is provided; I mean, it's in the legislation; I don't
21 want to beat this to death, but I guess I am,
22 Congress says I-10, and I-10 is closer than 15 miles.
23 So, I mean, it's not about Congress's intent. I
24 mean, it's Congress's statement

25 MR. SPARGO: I think what we'll do, then,

1 also is in laying out both sides we can also look at
2 clarifying the statement to direct it to 15 miles
3 within the adopted Canamex corridor, you know, the
4 Canamex --

5 CAT MEMBER: "Preferred," as you stated
6 earlier.

7 MR. SPARGO: -- again, draft responses,
8 but, you know, the adopted Canamex statement between
9 ADOT and MAG.

10 THE FACILITATOR: The next question is
11 for John.

12 For those of you who are new to the CAT,
13 you'll know that Chad is quite skillful in getting
14 multiple questions on the table and having a running
15 scenario with that all along, and we appreciate it.
16 Thanks, Chad.

17 We'll get back to you, Michael.

18 CAT MEMBER: Well, with regard to Chad's
19 comments on the Canamex and the fact that Congress
20 does designate the route I-10, my question becomes
21 without that clarity and without an absolute
22 definition on the part of ADOT and Maricopa County
23 that 8 and 85 are the actual Canamex designation,
24 that gives you an opportunity to be very expeditious,
25 because once the 202 Loop bypass is completed, items

1 that require mitigation on 88 -- on 8 and 85 aren't
2 going to come to fruition, because 202 already
3 exists, because you haven't made that clarity and you
4 haven't provided that certainty. So you obviate the
5 opportunity to complete that -- that proposed
6 preference. And I think that's a concern that hasn't
7 been addressed.

8 MR. SPARGO: Well, I mean, I-8 is a
9 completed interstate highway today. State Route 85
10 is -- there's been a number of improvements made that
11 were programmed in the RTP, including at the
12 connection to I-8 in Gila Bend, as well as widening
13 from Gila Bend all the way to I-10 in Buckeye for it
14 to be a four-lane facility throughout that area.

15 CAT MEMBER: And then north of Buckeye?

16 MR. SPARGO: And then north of Buckeye
17 there are, you know, there's plans, I mean, right now
18 there's a route using the, I think it's Vulture Mine
19 and other areas. But, you know, the long-term intent
20 would be where I-11 would, you know, replace that
21 facility and connect to, you know, at SR --

22 CAT MEMBER: I think it's the lack of
23 certainty that causes the real concern, I think, for
24 those people who have reason to believe that the
25 bypass route will track 202. I mean, it's pretty

1 clear on some of Canamex's own informational sites.

2 MR. SPARGO: Clear as to what?

3 CAT MEMBER: That the plan would have
4 been I-10, as opposed to the preferred route that you
5 guys identify. You're the only folks that represent
6 that as the preferred route. The congressional
7 statement doesn't say that, and Canamex people don't
8 necessarily say that. And none of the other counties
9 that would be participating in Canamex, Pinal or Pima
10 County, care, but they don't represent that in their
11 documents either. So you're the only group, this
12 particular highway segment's the only group that
13 represents that position. So I think clarity is what
14 we're seeking on that.

15 MR. SPARGO: Well, I mean, it's not just
16 this project that's pushing that out. MAG completed
17 a study in 2001 that identified -- that went through
18 a number of alternatives, including, you know, the
19 use of parts of this facility as part of it. And the
20 ultimate result of that study was designating I-8 and
21 SR 85 as their preferred Canamex corridor that was
22 later adopted by the regional council, ADOT, other
23 agencies stakeholded for part of that study that went
24 through the process of looking for other alternatives
25 and ultimately adopted I-8 and SR 85.

1 And part of that is also driving, you
2 know, why we're investing in State Route 85 with
3 money from the RTP today and into the future to
4 upgrade that facility and the efficiency of it.

5 THE FACILITATOR: Any more? Yes.

6 CAT MEMBER: I thought I heard you say
7 relative to Sonoran Desert Tortoise that mitigation
8 was talking or consulting more, and that's not really
9 mitigation. And I wondered if you would address
10 that. Like, I mean --

11 MR. SPARGO: So the question was with
12 regard to one of the mitigation items that we showed
13 on the slide was in regard to further consultation
14 and coordination regarding mitigation, and how that
15 plays into the process. I don't know, Curt, if you
16 want to --

17 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yeah, I think the
18 point there is that coordination will happen with the
19 Game & Fish department to determine what technical
20 aspect would potentially benefit for mitigating the
21 impacts. As a candidate species there is a
22 requirement, but the point is ADOT and FHWA, it's
23 their intent to continue the coordination and
24 communication with Game & Fish to try to find out
25 what might be something that would be mitigated.

1 CAT MEMBER: So wouldn't that -- I'm
2 just -- this is part of the same question, by the
3 way -- wouldn't that -- wouldn't that be something
4 that you would have wanted to have done already, you
5 know, so we could see --

6 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: The design of the
7 project still has to occur yet, so as design
8 continues or proceeds, then you're able to understand
9 what the impact is going to be. And you can
10 incorporate the design features that can, again,
11 mitigate impacts to the species.

12 MR. SPARGO: And, I mean, there is
13 mitigation. One of the other items touched on was
14 the multiuse crossings, and the development and
15 identification of where to locate those, you know,
16 we're in consultation with Game & Fish, as well as
17 the Gila River Indian Community, so there is
18 mitigation included in the project today, and I think
19 how we move forward and make sure that the intent of
20 that mitigation to serve the different species, you
21 know, continues to remain in the project is sort of
22 what that continued coordination would be about.

23 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Right. And that
24 is ADOT's standard procedures with any of these types
25 of projects.

1 THE FACILITATOR: Other questions on the
2 first round before we come back to Michael?

3 Yes.

4 CAT MEMBER: I'll jump on their two
5 questions.

6 THE FACILITATOR: Then we'll come back to
7 you?

8 CAT MEMBER: The distance of the freeway
9 will be, in the truck route, would be at least 10
10 miles less, and this reply was that it would be more
11 congested on the new freeway, but I thought the whole
12 idea of all the studies and all the information was
13 that by making the freeway, congestion would be down
14 significantly where it wouldn't really be congested.
15 So if I'm a trucker, I still want to go the shortest
16 route, especially if there's truck stops along that
17 route, whereas if I go I-8 to 85, I miss all the
18 Phoenix facilities, right? All the truck stops and
19 everything? I have to wait until I get to Tonopah or
20 something.

21 MR. SPARGO: Well, I definitely know that
22 the document doesn't state anywhere that this project
23 is going to solve all the problems, traffic-related
24 problems, in the Valley, such that, you know, it will
25 be free flow from, you know, Riggs Road all the way

1 out to Buckeye. What we're saying is that you
2 would -- you would have to enter, you know, the
3 metropolitan area, and we're talking about a
4 population of 3.6 million people, that's going to
5 continue to expand to 6 million. So while distance
6 is one factor, travel time is the other factor.

7 Now, at midnight it may make sense,
8 timewise you may be able to do it, but they are still
9 going to have to enter and sort of take that chance
10 to come into the -- not just on the east side, but
11 again, you're at -- you're at 59th Avenue and you
12 have to travel all the way to the west, and that area
13 is where we're going to see a lot of growth and where
14 there's a lot of congestion itself as well.

15 So our response is just that trucks that
16 are truly not doing anything in the Valley that don't
17 have any business or don't have any needed stops, you
18 know, in the Valley would be better served to use I-8
19 and SR 85 to bypass the metropolitan area. We do
20 discuss that we understand that trucks will use this
21 facility to facilitate their business within the
22 metropolitan area.

23 CAT MEMBER: Would you address that? I
24 didn't catch it in the numbers. I didn't read all
25 the details.

1 MR. SPARGO: One of the response --

2 CAT MEMBER: I know that was a response
3 in general, but do you actually have the data? What
4 I did see in the study said you don't really measure
5 the truck response versus what goes through versus
6 what goes around. And different than the rest of the
7 regional freeways in the area, none of the other
8 regional freeways connects to points that are highly
9 desirable to go from another metropolitan area, say,
10 Tucson or Texas to L.A. Whereas, this section would
11 have a through route perspective that you wouldn't
12 necessarily have on the 202 on the east side, right?
13 The 202 and the 60 through Globe. It's just not as
14 desirable a location as getting from Tucson, say, to
15 L.A., and I didn't see that aspect kind of indicated.

16 MR. SPARGO: There is -- there is a
17 figure in Chapter 3 that describes, basically, the
18 users of the freeway, we can either go through or I
19 can discuss it later, that shows basically what we
20 did is we took the MAG model and sort of captured all
21 the vehicles going through or all the projected
22 vehicles that would go through the bend of the
23 freeway, and identified their origin and destination.
24 And then sort of mapped those and grouped them to
25 sort of show --

1 CAT MEMBER: But you didn't compare that
2 to the current traffic on I-8 and I-85, did you? Did
3 you have that also?

4 MR. SPARGO: Well, that type of
5 information is some of -- is part of the study that
6 MAG is continually looking at, external trips --

7 CAT MEMBER: But it wasn't included in
8 here?

9 MR. SPARGO: Well, it's included in the
10 modeling that they do, so when we look at the
11 projected traffic on the facility, projecting who's
12 going to use the facility, there is a portion of that
13 traffic that will be vehicles that are starting
14 external to the metro area and their destination is
15 external to the metropolitan area, and that is
16 captured in the information that we present.

17 CAT MEMBER: Okay. I can look at that
18 while you ask Mike and the other guys.

19 THE FACILITATOR: Before we come back,
20 you've -- we've got two questions. You first and you
21 second.

22 CAT MEMBER: My question is water resources
23 that you have indicated on page 33. I notice the --
24 you had addressed a concern regarding the Foothills
25 Water Source on Section 4-100, basically the entire

1 page regarding that addressed some of their concerns.
2 On the southwest corner of Voya [phonetic] Street and
3 Pecos, there's a very large water well for the
4 Lakewood Community Association that supports 3,000
5 homes, and they're not even mentioned in the study.
6 Is there a reason for that? Based on your route
7 maps, that well would be displaced.

8 MR. SPARGO: Okay. I think that the
9 specific well is based on information that we've
10 heard, concerns that we've heard from the public, and
11 they've been primarily geared towards that well. But
12 any well impacted throughout the study area would be
13 treated in a similar fashion.

14 So it's really just trying to come up
15 with a representative condition that would then, you
16 know, similar negotiation and desire to find
17 replacement water and providing that would be done.

18 CAT MEMBER: If groundwater wasn't able
19 to be located, an alternative says here, "In the
20 event that well replacement is not possible, ADOT
21 would replace the well through alternative sources of
22 water." And could you elaborate a little bit on what
23 alternative sources of water would include?

24 MR. SPARGO: Yeah, I'll start, and then
25 I'll look to ADOT Right-of-Way to pipe in a little

1 bit. On page 4-100, if that's the reference, there
2 is almost a full page in there that goes through sort
3 of a four- or five-step process as far as how well
4 water is replaced. So it does discuss, you know,
5 sort of the plan A, B, C, and D, as far as how that
6 water would be replaced.

7 I don't know, Reggie, if you want to add
8 anything regarding the different sources of water
9 that would be available for replacing well water?

10 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: There's nothing I
11 can add to what you have already said.

12 MR. SPARGO: So I think anything would be
13 on the table if they're not able to find --

14 CAT MEMBER: And ADOT would be prepared
15 to cover the cost difference between the two? We
16 have a substantial history in that community in
17 trying to locate appropriate wells for our water
18 source, and they've proven extremely difficult, if
19 not impossible. And so we have a very large concern
20 about how that would get treated. If a well was
21 located south of the freeway, is there any way to get
22 the source of water north of the freeway?

23 MR. SPARGO: I do think that the first,
24 you know, plan A is to -- is to drill a new well
25 within 650 feet of the previous well, because that

1 reduces the amount of some of the clearances that you
2 have to complete.

3 CAT MEMBER: Unless you drill into
4 somebody's living room, it would need to be south of
5 the freeway.

6 MR. SPARGO: Okay.

7 CAT MEMBER: So is there a way to get the
8 source of the water from a well that's identified on
9 the south part of the freeway and get it to the north
10 side of the freeway?

11 MR. SPARGO: Yeah, I would assume it
12 could be pumped under the freeway. It wouldn't be
13 ADOT's desire, because they do not really like to
14 have utilities within their right-of-way.

15 CAT MEMBER: Nor would it be of the
16 community, I'm sure.

17 MR. SPARGO: I understand. Again, that
18 goes back to the whole, you know, everything will be
19 on a case-by-case basis.

20 CAT MEMBER: One of these guys would be
21 able to answer that. Is that what you're saying, I
22 mean, you're going to transport water across the
23 freeway if that's the last alternative, that's what
24 you're saying?

25 MR. SPARGO: I think it would be a

1 negotiation where we would look at all the different
2 options, and then we would select the option that is
3 most beneficial to everybody.

4 CAT MEMBER: Is that physically possible,
5 though, to pump it under, to do that, is that
6 something that can be done? I think the guy in the
7 green says you can, shaking your head up and down.

8 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I'm a terrible
9 poker player. Yeah, you can put directional drilling
10 and put a pipe underneath the freeway; they do it all
11 the time. That can definitely be done. It would be
12 on the range of options, like Ben says.

13 MR. SPARGO: I don't think we're --

14 CAT MEMBER: I don't think it would be
15 directional because it would be done before the road
16 was built, so I guess you could put the conduit
17 through there, but you can do all that, right?

18 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: It can be done.

19 CAT MEMBER: If you have enough money, you
20 can do just about anything.

21 THE FACILITATOR: Karen.

22 CAT MEMBER: I wanted to follow up on all
23 the Canamex conversation. How does something like
24 the I-8 and State Route 85 get enforced? I'm not
25 familiar with that, so if that is the designated

1 truck route, how does something like that get
2 enforced?

3 MR. SPARGO: The question was about
4 enforcement of the Canamex corridor or the truck
5 bypass route of I-8 and SR 85.

6 And I don't know if we have anybody here to
7 answer that specific question.

8 CAT MEMBER: Because I think that would be
9 part of the concern, is that if that's the designated
10 route, how do -- one, how do the truckers know that;
11 and two, how is it enforced? They can just say I'm
12 going take the shorter route because I want to stop
13 and go to the bathroom and take a shower and get some
14 food.

15 MR. STAPP: Well, I mean, it would -- it
16 would appear as though, I mean, it is signed on both
17 ends, so that's how they know, but basically, as far
18 as enforcement, I mean, please tell me if I'm wrong,
19 I don't see how you could, simply because a lot of
20 trucks have legitimate business within the Phoenix
21 downtown area.

22 CAT MEMBER: True.

23 MR. STAPP: And distinguishing those
24 vehicles, I would think, would be impossible.

25 CAT MEMBER: So there's no way to -- I

1 don't know how to phrase the rest of it.

2 CAT MEMBER: I think it says in the report
3 that they don't want to because it doesn't meet the
4 purpose and need. Right? That's the answer to her
5 question. In the report it addresses that.

6 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: And as I understand
7 it from talking to (unintelligible), who is familiar
8 with the route and has been around the agency for a
9 long time, I-8 and I-85 are assigned that way, but
10 also the truckers have maps; they're using maps; it's
11 usually indicated on the maps they have that they get
12 for traveling. It's not a Rand McNally map, it's a
13 map that they get from the American Trucker
14 Association that indicates the major routes.

15 THE FACILITATOR: Any other questions
16 before we go back on the second round? Everybody who
17 hasn't asked a question, would you like to ask one
18 before we move forward?

19 CAT MEMBER: Yes.

20 THE FACILITATOR: Okay.

21 CAT MEMBER: My name is Derrick Denis, and
22 I'm an environmental consultant and business owner
23 here in Arizona, Arizona Hair Company. Get your
24 haircut there, those of you who have hair still. I
25 represent the Foothills Preserve, 611 homes, Pecos

1 and 30th Avenue. I've been a member of this
2 committee or community, this group for, I think, over
3 eight years. It's been a while. And I appreciate
4 the hard work that goes into all these presentations.
5 My community and I acknowledge this is a vastly
6 complicated issue and we believe we are probably the
7 most, if not one of the most, impacted neighborhoods
8 by the construction of the freeway, and by the
9 existence of a constructed freeway.

10 We recognize, as a community, that there's
11 really no way to have these discussions without
12 sounding like a NIMBY, a "not in my backyard
13 advocate." But people in my community want some
14 assurances. They want assurances. Now, I know that
15 our ability here is not -- we don't have a lot of
16 sway. We have a vote in the community, as a
17 representative of build/no-build, but we don't have a
18 lot of the data that the community is asking for, my
19 community is asking for, I'm assuming all the
20 communities are asking for. Which is how will I get
21 to the I-10 freeway if this thing is built, how will
22 my children's bus reach our neighborhood when this
23 freeway is built. So these are the kinds of
24 questions I'm being asked over and over and over
25 again. I don't have the answers, although that's not

1 what this forum is for. Those are the questions that
2 the community is begging for.

3 The Environment Impact Statement is pretty
4 straightforward. Our noise levels right now, 45
5 decibels, background, unmitigated. We're going to go
6 up to 78 decibels, mitigated, a huge increase.
7 Mitigated we're going to be at 63 decibels, still a
8 huge increase. The light, the traffic, the air
9 quality, the real estate values, all these things are
10 degradations to our community and our perception, and
11 I'm assuming that everyone is on board with that,
12 that seems logical, a degradation to our community.

13 So my question to the group, and I don't
14 know how many community folks are here, I think most
15 people here are experts and involved with this
16 project, what is the abbreviated message I should
17 deliver to my community? Is the message, "I'm sorry,
18 too bad, it's for the greater good, suck it up,
19 you're going to get what you get" or is there a more
20 positive message that I can deliver? And that's my
21 question to this group.

22 MR. SPARGO: I think that's a tough
23 question, but I mean, it's a good question. I think
24 some of the concerns related to, you know, if it's
25 built, you know, how do I get around, some of that

1 information is not directly in the Draft EIS, but it
2 is available on the website. We do have maps that
3 show within the online hearing what the freeway would
4 look like, where the access points would be along the
5 freeway.

6 I can't say that based on -- based on our
7 implementation and construction phasing plan that
8 traffic would continue to be open. If we do build
9 the freeway in a similar fashion to where Pecos Road
10 is, it would be built such that part of the freeway
11 would be built north of Pecos Road while traffic
12 remains active on Pecos Road itself, and then when we
13 go to construct the south half of the freeway,
14 traffic would be shifted to the north half of the
15 freeway with some temporary ramps to continue to
16 provide access, so during construction we wouldn't be
17 detouring all traffic to Chandler Boulevard; there
18 would be a similar facility available to move traffic
19 as Pecos Road.

20 To your community itself, the nearest
21 access point would be at 17th Avenue, but Chandler
22 Boulevard would be constructed from where it ends at
23 around 19th Avenue through the -- through the 620
24 property or along the state land where Phoenix has
25 recently purchased property to connect from, I think,

1 around 19th Avenue out to Chandler Boulevard or 27th
2 Avenue to provide access to the communities at the
3 far west end of the facility.

4 CAT MEMBER: You said those statements, for
5 example, that's a big question is the Chandler --

6 MR. SPARGO: There are some maps in Chapter
7 3 of the Draft EIS that go into local access, and how
8 certain properties that access will be impacted, how
9 that would be sort of reconnected within local
10 access.

11 CAT MEMBER: Okay.

12 MR. SPARGO: I mean, the broader question
13 about, you know, about the greater good. I do think
14 that that is generally the message where we're at in
15 the process right now, is that ADOT and MAG and
16 FHWA have decided to put forth this alternative.
17 They have identified a build alternative; the W-59
18 and E-1 is their preferred alternative at this time.
19 We're looking for public input, comments and
20 questions for them to consider as they continue
21 forth. If they continue along that build alternative
22 direction, you know, what they really want to hear is
23 how -- how do we make this facility the least
24 impactful to the communities that it will be
25 impacting?

1 I don't know -- that is a complete answer.
2 I don't know if anybody wants to add to that, but
3 that's generally the -- you know, how the Draft
4 EIS is presented, it goes through and identifies the
5 need and why the freeway is the best mode to meet
6 that need. And it goes through all the different
7 alternatives, and because there's no other action
8 alternatives in the eastern section, it identifies
9 the E-1 as the preferred alternative.

10 THE FACILITATOR: I need to let you know at
11 this point we've reached within, actually, six
12 seconds of our 40-minute time allotment for the
13 questions. I know we have a number of questions to
14 continue. Is it the pleasure of the CAT to continue
15 in the question period and extend it beyond the 40
16 minutes?

17 CAT MEMBER: Yes, it is for me.

18 THE FACILITATOR: Okay. We'll do so.
19 Anyone else who hasn't asked a question in the first
20 round who would like to do so, please do so now.

21 CAT MEMBER: Is there going to be a time
22 limit on this extension?

23 THE FACILITATOR: That's a good question.
24 Do you want to establish a time limit? One of the
25 things you can consider is this, we have everybody

1 assembled here to hopefully answer the questions as
2 much as they can without a parking lot scenario, so I
3 would encourage you to get your questions answered.
4 For those who don't, if these periods of time get
5 extended where we actually need to go and leave the
6 facility, the questions can still be submitted and
7 answered at a later date. So it is your call.

8 Do you want to increase these
9 question-and-answer periods by 15-minute increments?
10 If so, we can do that. Fred's keeping time, and I'll
11 call time at the end of 15 minutes and we'll decide
12 where we are at that point. Is that fair enough?

13 CAT MEMBER: Agreed.

14 THE FACILITATOR: Fred, start the clock.

15 Okay. Michael, we're back to you and then
16 Alan.

17 CAT MEMBER: Okay. My second question,
18 which was actually one that I had submitted and there
19 was no discussion on it, is for those who like to
20 follow along with things, with regards, the only
21 place I can find any reference to is in Chapter 5,
22 page 16, the map on the right, which sort of shows
23 the ridges and the proposed freeway.

24 And the question I have, if you look at
25 that map, there is a difference from where the

1 mountain preserve line goes, you can see it goes on
2 an angle, between the north ridge and the south ridge
3 and the community line. And the freeway then goes on
4 the inside of the community line.

5 The question I have, between those two
6 areas, there's about, I figured, somewhere between 2-
7 to 300 acres of private land, which I can find
8 absolutely no mention of mitigation or anything; if
9 the freeway is built, as it is shown, there's no exit
10 being considered for any of the private property. I
11 mean, I understand where the freeway cuts through,
12 there's probably about three or four property owners
13 there. They will be dealt with. The question really
14 is there's still a whole chunk of private land that's
15 left over.

16 And besides, for that I know for a fact,
17 even though I know it's not directly mentioned, that
18 once you get into the preserve, you also get into a
19 number of cultural sites that that -- there's an old
20 road that leads right to it. So what I'm trying to
21 find out, I guess, bringing it together is something
22 about that. There's no mention, at least I couldn't
23 find any mention, of that entire area anywhere in the
24 draft.

25 MR. SPARGO: Yeah, I mean, so the question

1 was dealing with this property that sits between the
2 south ridge and the north ridge, and just what the
3 outcome would be with the --

4 CAT MEMBER: The private land, within that.

5 MR. SPARGO: Again, we're going to go back
6 to the fact that throughout the document we do not
7 identify mitigation for every single piece of private
8 land that we're impacting. We do provide specific or
9 mitigation for how they will be dealt with, and
10 that's what was presented throughout the
11 presentation. So, again, these properties would be
12 dealt with on a case-by-case basis, based on their
13 condition, what access they have today, you know,
14 what access is going to be provided in the future,
15 and that would be negotiated with ADOT Right-of-Way
16 and the property owner during the acquisition
17 process, so it would be -- and the question it would
18 be up to them to show that they have access to the
19 property today, legal access, and then --

20 CAT MEMBER: Legal -- let me -- right now
21 there are -- only access is actually through the
22 community land, and I don't know under state law, is
23 that considered legal access even?

24 MR. SPARGO: And again, I think that would
25 be something that ADOT Right-of-Way would investigate

1 at the time of the acquisition process, because we're
2 not out, you know, talking to every single property
3 owner and figuring out all of this right now. That a
4 lot of that activity will kick off after the record
5 of decision. But at that time they would determine,
6 you know, what the requirements are to acquire that
7 property.

8 THE FACILITATOR: Al?

9 CAT MEMBER: My second question is will
10 Federal Highway Administration and ADOT propose
11 mitigation strategies to reduce greenhouse gas
12 emissions either during construction or during the
13 lifetime of the freeway? An example might be to
14 provide incentives for contractors who are doing the
15 construction to adhere to the green roads standards
16 or guidelines.

17 MR. SPARGO: Yeah, the question was dealing
18 with greenhouses gases, and whether ADOT and
19 FHWA proposed any mitigation to reduce or minimize
20 greenhouse gas emissions during either conduction or
21 operation of the freeway. I'll look to either Scott
22 or Darcy to help.

23 MR. STAPP: Well, and I think the answer is
24 currently there's no mitigation proposed, but again,
25 I think that it's something that we would take back

1 to ADOT and FHWA and examine that with them to see
2 if, in fact, it is something they want to pursue?

3 CAT MEMBER: All right. Thank you.

4 THE FACILITATOR: Second question or first
5 question from anybody on the second round, Chad and
6 then Michael?

7 CAT MEMBER: The census projections that
8 were or the census numbers that were used so they
9 were 2005 in the report, this may be something for
10 the MAG guys so it was 2005 in the report, in the --
11 that we -- that we based all of the population, all
12 the socioeconomic stuff was based on the 2005 special
13 census, it says in here that MAG is now in the
14 process of adopting new projections based on the 2010
15 census, which I think is what we should be doing all
16 along, so it seems like MAG is on board with that
17 concept, but it says that these new projections will
18 be incorporated into the Final EIS, if they're not in
19 the draft. If they show up for the first time in the
20 final, how are we able to review and comment on them?

21 MR. SPARGO: The question was how the
22 public -- I guess what the review process is for the
23 Final EIS when it comes to new information that's
24 presented in the Final EIS. I don't know if any NEPA
25 or FHWA want to address sort of that process?

1 MR. STAPP: I mean, the Final EIS when it's
2 released will be available for a 60-day review for
3 the public.

4 CAT MEMBER: But then how do we -- so
5 there's -- you're saying then that's -- all of our --
6 the way I understand our ability to dispute any of
7 this stuff down the road, and maybe I'm wrong on
8 this, is that it needs to be done by the end of the
9 draft period, so in order to get stuff into the
10 final, we've got to dispute the draft. So if the
11 final comes out, there's really no mechanism we can
12 make some comments, but you don't have to address
13 them, right?

14 MR. STAPP: That is correct.

15 CAT MEMBER: So how do we -- so any of our
16 concerns with how you're viewing the 2010 numbers,
17 which are what your purpose and need will be based
18 on, an important part of this report, we won't be
19 able to get a response from you out of? That doesn't
20 seem to me to be appropriate. It seems to me that's
21 the whole purpose of the draft process, right, is to
22 give you the opportunity if we identify something as
23 being incorrect to fix it? The final process doesn't
24 provide a mechanism for that.

25 Would you agree with that?

1 MR. STAPP: I would agree that there is a
2 review process, but it's not necessarily -- and you
3 can submit comments, but FHWA is not obligated to
4 address those comments.

5 CAT MEMBER: Yeah, and so something that
6 important shouldn't you retain that ability to have
7 those questions addressed, just like you're doing now
8 very well, shouldn't that very important -- the
9 purpose and need, at least the purpose and need, I
10 mean, if you want to step down to some of the smaller
11 stuff in the report, I mean, even if you want to go
12 to whether it's above grade or below grade, I mean,
13 but purpose and need seems to me to be an important
14 part of this. Shouldn't we have the ability to
15 review that stuff through a draft process?

16 MR. SPARGO: I think that --

17 CAT MEMBER: I guess no is the answer.

18 MR. SPARGO: I think the answer is no. I
19 think the information that's presented in the draft
20 is the best information that we had available at the
21 time of submitting the Draft EIS. It's not going to
22 be the only thing that is updated in the final, and
23 that if there is a significant change, let's say, in
24 the purpose and need, like the new projections are,
25 you know, totally different than what --

1 CAT MEMBER: They are.

2 MR. SPARGO: -- than what they were
3 projected in 2005, we'll have to evaluate how to move
4 forward with that.

5 CAT MEMBER: I think you must agree that
6 2005 is dated or you wouldn't be making an update
7 using 2010, which, as we know, is three and a half
8 years ago. So this draft was released, you know,
9 three months ago, which was well into 2013, and we
10 had the 2010 census; that's why I think it's getting
11 updated, but it would be good, I think, to retain the
12 ability to review those numbers because they're going
13 to vary and we all know they're significantly
14 different from -- 2005 projections were based on a
15 very high growth period; 2010 was hardly that.

16 I'm good. Thank you.

17 THE FACILITATOR: Michael.

18 CAT MEMBER: I'm torn between which
19 direction I want to go in, because I've got really
20 two follow-ups to other commentary. What I wanted to
21 talk about, though, again was the routing as it
22 relates to truck traffic. And in the EI -- in the
23 Draft EIS, ADOT proposes or you state, you postulate
24 how much truck traffic and how much freight actually
25 is handled in Phoenix. Roughly a third of the

1 freight in the United States reaches our area. And
2 that you identify a significant percentage of it
3 simply bypasses us. But what's omitted in the study
4 and what's not discussed is what you mean by
5 "bypasses us," because we have so many
6 freight-handling facilities, particularly on the west
7 end, the freight bypasses us. Not utilizing your
8 preferred route, but through the spoke and hub system
9 of the intermodal transportation that exists with
10 Swift and Knight and the other transportation
11 companies.

12 So trucks coming in from the east terminate
13 at a hub on 51st Avenue, even though their loads will
14 continue to go west or north, they drop their load,
15 they terminate, pick up a load, and go back. So
16 that's how freight bypasses Phoenix to a significant
17 percentage. It really never utilizes that Canamex
18 bypass route, because it needs to reach its hub along
19 the 51st Avenue route.

20 So that question is not addressed, I think
21 it speaks to Karen's issue as to how do you enforce
22 it? Well, you can't because somewhere along your
23 preferred route they're going to have to track
24 backward to get to 51st Avenue, more of a comment
25 than a question, because it's not addressed here.

1 And it kind of makes me concerned, because in Chad's
2 question you're using data that's clearly inaccurate
3 on its face right now, today, in this study and if
4 it's addressed and our questions and complaints
5 during the open session, we've got until July and you
6 knock that low-hanging fruit back to us, then you
7 change direction midstream and use new, updated
8 figures that we can't address.

9 And again, similar to the way that the
10 truck traffic and the loads are handled doesn't seem
11 appropriate. That's two individual instances, not to
12 mention what I think would be AI would have with
13 MSATs. It's out there. We don't see a need to solve
14 it, because we don't have the right data to solve it,
15 so we don't really think it's a problem, we're going
16 to skip over it, and update it later. And I think
17 that's an issue because we can't address it
18 effectively or factually with the data that you've
19 presented because the data is out of date and
20 incorrect.

21 I guess the question would be is how are
22 you going to fix that?

23 MR. SPARGO: Well, I think that what we do
24 is that the Final EIS will include the updated
25 socioeconomic information. It will also include any

1 other updates that we've identified. There's some
2 other information with regard to jurisdictional
3 waters; noise would be updated based on the new
4 traffic data, things like that. So there's going to
5 be updated information in the Final EIS. The other
6 thing that will be in the Final EIS is a series of
7 appendices that would include all the comments and
8 concerns that we hear from this group, as well as the
9 public hearings, and things that were submitted via
10 e-mail that will each be responded to directly in the
11 appendices. And the Final EIS will allow you to
12 review the document, as well as your comments and
13 concerns, and those responses. And if there are
14 further responses that you're able to make comments
15 to ADOT and FHWA, they'll consider those comments;
16 there's no, you know, as been stated, there's no
17 requirement that they provide you with a direct
18 response, but they would consider those concerns.

19 CAT MEMBER: Right, so you give us one bite
20 at the apple, but it's incomplete. That's my
21 concern.

22 THE FACILITATOR: We have completed -- I
23 believe we have completed the first extra 15-minute
24 segment. Would you like another?

25 CAT MEMBER: I would like one more.

1 THE FACILITATOR: Okay.

2 CAT MEMBER: I'm good with that.

3 THE FACILITATOR: That seems like a good
4 use of our time. When we get close, when they throw
5 us out of the building, we'll have to back up on
6 that, because we have a couple other agenda items,
7 but we certainly have time for another 15-minute
8 segment.

9 CAT MEMBER: When are we required to leave
10 the building?

11 THE FACILITATOR: 9:00.

12 Ready to start the clock, Fred?

13 Who is next? Anybody who hasn't asked a
14 question?

15 CAT MEMBER: On the second one?

16 THE FACILITATOR: Yes. At some point I'm
17 going to get lost on what round we're on.

18 CAT MEMBER: I have a lot of questions, but
19 I'm just going to ask one. So maybe you can point me
20 in the EIS where I can find this, but I'm wondering
21 if there was any kind of economic analysis of the
22 costs associated with failing to meet the air quality
23 standards in the Phoenix area relative to increased
24 emissions associated with this freeway, and
25 particularly, the increased truck traffic. And so

1 there's both the health impacts, which are of great
2 concern, and the economic aspect of those health
3 impacts, but also just the cost overall of not
4 meeting our quality standards.

5 MR. SPARGO: I -- I'm going to -- I don't
6 think that it is addressed. The question was
7 regarding whether there's an economic analysis of not
8 meeting the regional, you know, air quality
9 conformity.

10 CAT MEMBER: Consider it an indirect,
11 perhaps --

12 MR. SPARGO: I don't believe it's included
13 in the EIS, although I do know that Lindsay Bauer
14 from MAG, the air quality panel, in April went
15 through a pretty thorough review of the sort of the
16 conformity process, as well as how this project, you
17 know, as the regional plan, how it sort of works into
18 that, as well as how MAG is budgeting for the
19 different criteria pollutants and things like that,
20 and how this project sort of falls into that plan.

21 So there's a lot of information provided
22 based on that, but I think the -- the other response
23 from this group would be that the South Mountain
24 Freeway, as part of the regional transportation plan,
25 is in MAG's different air quality conformity

1 planning. So they have, you know, and those plans
2 show it conforming to the different thresholds and
3 budgets moving forward. Is that generally right?

4 MR. STAPP: Yeah.

5 MR. SPARGO: So I think your question to me
6 is sort of pushing a negative, saying that project Y
7 is going to cause MAG to not meet those criteria,
8 where what was presented by Lindsay showed that they
9 could include a project in their plan that would --
10 that would cause the plan to not be in compliance
11 with the regulations.

12 So this project is included in their -- in
13 their transportation plan that they're using to show
14 conformity with FHWA and EPA.

15 THE FACILITATOR: Al, I think -- are we to
16 you? Anyone else on the second round?

17 CAT MEMBER: Is there any representatives
18 from the Gila River Indian Community here today?

19 MR. SPARGO: Not that I know of.

20 CAT MEMBER: Can ADOT provide some feedback
21 to me on what options would be available for if and
22 possibly when GRIC decides to make a route on their
23 land for consideration between now and when you start
24 construction?

25 MR. SPARGO: Yeah, the question, I think,

1 is generally asking about the process or how a GRIC
2 alignment would be worked into the process between
3 now and the record of decision or even into, you
4 know, getting ready to start construction. I'll try
5 to answer. I think that the answer that we've
6 discussed internally is really it all depends on when
7 that comes. As far as how it would be incorporated
8 and what that proposal by them looks like, and
9 whether it's something that FHWA and ADOT can move
10 forward with. So it's hard to answer, you know, if
11 it -- if it comes between, you know, now and the
12 final Draft EIS or Final EIS being released, ADOT and
13 FHWA would consider how best to present that. It
14 could be in the form of another Draft EIS where we
15 would have another hearing and go through this review
16 process again. It also could be done as an addendum,
17 but it all just kind of depends on when in the
18 process occurs, and what that actual proposal looks
19 like.

20 CAT MEMBER: Do you think there would be a
21 large change in the EIS on a route further south of
22 Pecos? Or would it -- there's a lot of similarities,
23 so would it really change a whole lot?

24 MR. SPARGO: Well, we would have to do the
25 same type of and level of analysis from the design

1 side, as well as the environmental side, for that
2 alignment, so all of the Chapter 4 sections that have
3 tables and graphics and things like that, we would
4 have to do the same type of analysis for an
5 alternative on their land, you know. It is a very
6 different, you know, condition than what the Pecos
7 Road alignment is.

8 Now, regarding, you know, and I think as an
9 alignment, it does have its benefits as far as
10 avoiding some of the community as well as the, you
11 know, Section 4(f) parts of the park and things like
12 that, so it depends on what that alignment, where
13 it's located, because, in some respects, we are sort
14 of -- we have less flexibility in that it likely
15 would be an alignment dictated by the community, not
16 something where we would get to select our preference
17 for an alignment on their land.

18 CAT MEMBER: So in summary, ADOT is open to
19 that option still?

20 MR. SPARGO: Yeah, I mean, I think that as
21 we've stated throughout, that, you know, the
22 communication is open with the community on that
23 subject, as well as, you know, they are right
24 adjacent to the planned freeway, so it would be
25 working on other activities, but we will just have to

1 wait and if that time comes up, we would address it
2 based on what the proposal is.

3 THE FACILITATOR: Al. Anyone else before
4 we go to Al?

5 CAT MEMBER: Ready for third round? I may
6 have missed this during my review of the EIS, but
7 will the project include any park and ride lots or
8 any other mass transit-related infrastructure, such
9 as providing for a sufficient right-of-way to allow
10 for a new rail transportation alternative someday?

11 MR. SPARGO: I'll try to hit that in the
12 two parts. The first part or the second part about
13 the rail is that it does not include additional
14 right-of-way beyond what's needed for the freeway
15 itself. For a future rail corridor. With regard to
16 transit-related facilities, we are including the HOV
17 lanes with the construction of the freeway, as well
18 as a directed HOV connection at I-10 in the west, so
19 that HOV traffic can go directly from the South
20 Mountain Freeway to and from the downtown direction
21 along I-10.

22 There are no specific set-aside pieces of
23 lands for park and ride lots; however, I would assume
24 that, you know, ADOT Right-of-Way would work with
25 Valley Metro and other, the City of Phoenix, that if

1 there are remnant parcels from the freeway
2 right-of-way acquisition, that, you know, they would
3 definitely work with them, if any of those locations
4 would be good candidates for park and ride or other
5 transit centers.

6 THE FACILITATOR: Next question?

7 CAT MEMBER: Whether this is a bypass or
8 not, so it seems to me that in the report, in these
9 responses here you say, "It provides an alternative
10 route to the highly congested I-10." Apparently,
11 that's in the RTP. In the 1985, oh, the ballot, that
12 everyone, the proposition, I don't know if it was 300
13 at that time, which number it was, says it will
14 connect as we've described, the purpose of it, but it
15 will also function as a bypass route.

16 So is it a -- do you agree that it's a
17 bypass route? And if you do, how does that -- which
18 you seem to because of these two statements that I
19 just described -- how does that -- you then go on to
20 say, "It's not the goal of ADOT and FHWA for the
21 proposed freeway to function as a truck bypass."

22 MR. SPARGO: Well, I think part of it is in
23 your definition of what "bypass" means.

24 CAT MEMBER: What would your definition of
25 that be?

1 MR. SPARGO: I would say it provides an
2 alternative route to I-10, so it bypasses that
3 section of I-10 through the Broadway curve and
4 downtown Phoenix?

5 CAT MEMBER: I think everyone would agree
6 with that. So it is a bypass, so we've decided that
7 it does do some of that.

8 MR. SPARGO: Just as just about every other
9 of the loop freeways bypass a certain segment of
10 congested areas, the Red Mountain Freeway provides a
11 bypass to the 60 to provide additional east/west
12 connectivity. The 101 is somewhat of a bypass for
13 I-17, depending on where you're coming from, so --

14 CAT MEMBER: Why does it then say in the
15 report that it's not a goal to function as a truck
16 bypass, so you're saying -- it's a goal to function
17 as a vehicle bypass but not at that truck bypass in
18 light of what Mike said about all the warehouses
19 being up in that area?

20 MR. SPARGO: Well, I think that and the use
21 of the truck bypass, we're getting more into the
22 questions that we've heard today about this being the
23 Canamex corridor, this being the route that every
24 single truck going through Phoenix is going to use,
25 so I think that's possibly where we are, and we're

1 not building this facility specifically for trucks;
2 it's really going to serve a larger commuter purpose
3 of moving traffic from the East to the West Valley.

4 So I think that's where sort of the
5 differentiator is, that it's not specifically being
6 built for trucks.

7 CAT MEMBER: Oh, no, no. And it doesn't
8 say that, it just says it's -- it's not a goal. I
9 mean, it is a goal for it to function as a truck --
10 to give the ability for trucks to go wherever they
11 want to do what you just described so that is the
12 goal of it, to say that it's not the goal -- that
13 it's the goal to give vehicles an alternative route,
14 but not the goal to give trucks an alternative route
15 is incorrect. I mean, because it's -- because it
16 goes on to say that limiting trucks wouldn't meet the
17 purpose and need.

18 Maybe I should have said that because
19 that's important to note, too. I mean, it says that
20 you, under mitigation, none of these -- you could --
21 you could restrict trucks, it says in there, but then
22 it goes on to say that that wouldn't meet the purpose
23 and need. So that says that it is a truck bypass. I
24 mean, so is it a truck -- is it intended to give the
25 ability for trucks to bypass certain other areas of

1 the RTP and if it is, why does it say it's not a goal
2 in the report, in one area?

3 MR. SPARGO: I think that in the way that
4 we're sort of meeting on this and that we can look at
5 how it's put, and whether it's talking about that
6 larger bypass of the whole metropolitan area or the
7 bypass of I-10.

8 So I agree -- so I'm saying I agree that we
9 need to look at how that's phrased and make sure that
10 it's referring to the correct definition as we've
11 just discussed bypass.

12 CAT MEMBER: Is it a truck bypass or not?

13 MR. SPARGO: Well, I mean, it's an
14 all-vehicle -- it's going to provide a bypass of I-10
15 through the Broadway curve and downtown area.

16 CAT MEMBER: So it will function as a truck
17 bypass?

18 MR. SPARGO: Yes.

19 CAT MEMBER: Okay. All right.

20 THE FACILITATOR: How many minutes we have,
21 Fred?

22 We have a minute 20 seconds in this current
23 segment. One more question in this segment and then
24 we'll talk about whether you want another one or not?

25 CAT MEMBER: The hazardous transport,

1 because I know I looked, and I guess the Phoenix area
2 there's only two areas that are restricted for
3 hazardous cargo; and that's under the tunnel in
4 Margaret Hance Park and the Salt River, the 202, and
5 that's one of the questions I asked. If you added
6 that one section, a limited access freeway, there's
7 no routes, if you're where we live -- I'm about as
8 far out as you can get -- if there were a chlorine
9 chemical spill, and chlorine is heavily used in the
10 drinking water, so if there were some sort of an
11 accident with that, the only way we would have to go
12 is the limited access on Chandler or the existing
13 arterial streets and all of them head east; there's
14 no southern route, northern route, or western route;
15 isn't that trouble?

16 I know you'd said there would be drainage
17 for collection, but you know we just had that in the
18 East Coast; they had that train derailment, I know, a
19 few years ago. We had one in a remote area where
20 there was a train derailment that had a nasty spill;
21 this is a heavily populated area, and I would be
22 curious what the response was

23 MR. SPARGO: The question was just about
24 the transport of hazardous materials and sort of what
25 the, you know, how the different routes or

1 restrictions are done. I don't know, Kelly, if you
2 wanted to touch on sort of the process that goes into
3 designated thumb routes.

4 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Sure. Every
5 freeway or highway has a -- Kelly, hold on a second,
6 let me get the --

7 THE REPORTER: He needs to speak up. I
8 can't hear him.

9 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I'm not loud enough?
10 Thank you. Basically, the functional classification
11 of this freeway would be just like any other limited
12 access freeway in the state, in that hazardous
13 materials cargo within the restrictions of hazardous
14 cargo and material designation, in the events of an
15 accident where they would, say, close the freeway for
16 a period of time and clean it up, I believe your
17 question would be what would happen to the traffic.

18 CAT MEMBER: What would happen to the
19 people that live in an area that would have to be
20 evacuated; there's very little routes out. Right?

21 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: The emergency
22 responders of every jurisdiction have a contingency
23 plan. Your emergency responders have primary
24 control. ADOT has a series of hazardous materials
25 contractors that they have available to augment the

1 emergency responders in an area, if required, but in
2 terms of rerouting of traffic, that falls within the
3 jurisdiction of the state patrol or what is it here,
4 DPS. And they would make the determination.

5 Now, if you had a hazardous materials
6 behind you, obviously, they could not go onto a
7 public street as an alternative; they would have to
8 wait until the properly designated road is reopened,
9 so that's how that would be dealt with.

10 Does that answer the question?

11 CAT MEMBER: It's the answer you have, but
12 it's not one that I look forward to. Right?

13 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Nobody looks forward
14 to that kind of an accident. But there are
15 contingency plans and emergency responders that have
16 this all in their plan.

17 THE FACILITATOR: We are at the end of the
18 15-minute segment. Would you like another?

19 CAT MEMBER: Yes.

20 If there's only one question, let's limit
21 it down to that question.

22 THE FACILITATOR: Let's deal with it.

23 Chris, go ahead.

24 CAT MEMBER: Dealing with mitigation of
25 issues in this study, our community has several

1 that -- questions that -- who do we contact
2 specifically if we wanted more detail on an answer?

3 MR. SPARGO: Let me just clarify the
4 question.

5 CAT MEMBER: We have -- we are going to be
6 having displacement issues regarding houses, as well
7 as a well, water wells. And we're interested in
8 learning more about this before the public hearing
9 process is concluded. Who can I contact to get more
10 detailed specific answers to the questions?

11 MR. SPARGO: ADOT Right-of-Way is the
12 correct place to go. They, outside of calling them
13 in their office, they also will be present at all the
14 public forums that we'll have. The public forum in
15 the Ahwatukee area is next Tuesday evening. So
16 they'll be located there, if there are residents that
17 would like to come and speak with ADOT Right-of-Way
18 representatives.

19 We're in kind of a, you know, unique area
20 of the study in that we're in this 90-day comment
21 period. So typically questions that are submitted to
22 the website or e-mailed or, you know, come in through
23 different avenues are grouped in with all those
24 comments that will go to the Final EIS, so you won't
25 get an immediate response to those questions.

1 But we do have some representatives from
2 ADOT Right-of-Way here today that could possibly hook
3 up with you after the meeting, get you contact
4 information, but also, that they'll be at all of the
5 public forums. They were at the public hearing. We
6 bring them everywhere we go.

7 CAT MEMBER: Can you ask them to identify
8 themselves, please.

9 MR. SPARGO: Yeah, Reggie, I don't know if
10 you want to raise your hand.

11 CAT MEMBER: Thank you.

12 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: And let me add that
13 there's information on the back table that are left
14 on our schedule. So those who are interested,
15 there's a stack of advertisements for you to take
16 back to your community.

17 THE FACILITATOR: Thank you for the
18 question period.

19 We are now at the agenda item on the
20 recommendation process, and if you would be kind
21 enough to look at that slide in the packet. Fred's
22 going to put it up on the screen. We have just a few
23 minutes before we open the questions to the general
24 public. Those of you who are members of the
25 committee, I encourage you to stay for the last

1 couple of minutes, because we have some closing
2 remarks to give you more direction before we
3 conclude.

4 You may recall, folks, that a number of
5 months ago now, it might have even been more than a
6 year and a half ago, we talked about "the end game"
7 for this particular system advisory team. That end
8 game was supposed to provide a recommendation from
9 your organization that you represent. And we talked
10 about and adopted a form for gathering that
11 recommendation from your organization that forms
12 drafts on the screen and in your packet. And
13 essentially it states the purpose of this particular
14 team, and the fact that this recommendation is coming
15 on behalf of that organization to build or no-build
16 and a place to provide some comments.

17 We are at that point now and if you look at
18 the agenda, the schedule of events on the left side
19 of the slide, that we are getting to the point where
20 we've got through the various activities associated
21 with the Citizens Advisory Team, and we're at the
22 point beginning tomorrow where we're going to open
23 that recommendation process to your organizations and
24 try to conclude that by July 24th, to fit into the
25 schedule that you've heard outlined here tonight.

1 And so there's a number of ways that we can
2 get this document to your organization for you to
3 make the recommendation. One of the methods will be
4 that Fred will be providing you, via e-mail with a
5 link to click on that link. That will produce this
6 form for you to complete and it will be submitted.

7 For those of you who don't have access to
8 computers or the Internet, we can do this through the
9 mail, if you like. But we would like to review the
10 form itself, build or no-build, and any comments your
11 organization may want to add. You'll notice on the
12 bottom of this particular form an attachment, should
13 you want to provide some attachments to this. We
14 can't do it on the Survey Monkey, but you can do it
15 as an e-mail to Fred and he'll incorporate it into
16 the packet. And if you're doing that through snail
17 mail, he'll attach that to your recommendation.

18 This needs to be reviewed by your
19 organization. You have been kind enough all these
20 months and in many cases all these years, to
21 represent your organization with integrity. And we
22 don't want that to slip at the end. This
23 recommendation needs to be vetted by your
24 organization, and the response provided. We all on
25 the same page on what we agreed to a while back? We

1 still in agreement?

2 We'll send this stuff via e-mail to you, if
3 you request a hard copy, just give Fred a call or
4 e-mail at his normal contact, and he'll get you that
5 information and we're going to follow the deadline.

6 CAT MEMBER: When will this go out,
7 tomorrow or --

8 THE FACILITATOR: Will it go out as early
9 as tomorrow?

10 MR. ERIKSON: Yes.

11 CAT MEMBER: And the following is
12 recommendation of blank member, should that be our
13 name or the organization we're representing?

14 THE FACILITATOR: On the Survey Monkey, it
15 will have the name of your organization; it won't
16 have a place for your individual name. Your
17 organization will be the entity. Okay? Good
18 question.

19 CAT MEMBER: And the results of this will
20 be posted online? How do we know what the results
21 were?

22 MR. SPARGO: Yes, as part of the -- it will
23 be posted in the normal CAT meeting information.
24 When we have all finalized, it will also be
25 incorporated into the Final EIS as well.

1 CAT MEMBER: So you -- so you can't send
2 something out on July 25th when you count the ballots
3 in your office? Seems pretty easy to do. 12 people
4 said no-build and 13 people said build, seems pretty
5 easy.

6 MR. SPARGO: Yeah, and that's part of how
7 it's going to be reported by KCA.

8 CAT MEMBER: Seems a little too convoluted.

9 MR. SPARGO: Sorry.

10 THE FACILITATOR: As long as you're giving
11 us the authority to send these results out through
12 e-mail, we can do that; is that okay with
13 everybody?

14 CAT MEMBER: I'd also like to know who
15 doesn't respond. I would like to know if you have a
16 lack of response. I think that's important for
17 accountability.

18 MR. SPARGO: Yeah, I mean, I think that in
19 the response, however we do it, you'll either be able
20 to tell based on who is missing, because we'll
21 definitely identify organization and their
22 recommendation, so either by absence or some other
23 way.

24 THE FACILITATOR: I appreciate the
25 committee staying together for a few more minutes,

1 while we take questions from the public.

2 CAT MEMBER: I have one procedural question
3 about the vote. Since we're a committee that is met
4 and required for a quorum, how could, if you have
5 members that don't vote, and they fall below a
6 certain threshold, unless you have at least 13 votes,
7 you won't have -- you've got to have enough votes to
8 have a quorum on our recommendation, how are you
9 going to make sure that occurs?

10 THE FACILITATOR: I'm not sure that we have
11 to have a quorum of the votes. We had to have our
12 quorum per our operating agreement with one another
13 at the individual meeting. When it comes to the
14 votes, the votes are your votes, and I think that's
15 consistent with our operating agreement but good
16 point. Any other comments or questions?

17 THE FACILITATOR: Okay. If you have a
18 question, please bring it up to me. As has been our
19 process in the past, we have a period of time to read
20 questions from the general public. We will read as
21 many of them as we can before Fred calls time. If a
22 question is provided and not answered due to time
23 limitations, it will be answered and posted on the
24 website, the way we've been doing.

25 So, fair enough? I'm going to do my best

1 on this, so if I botch up some words, let me know.

2 Are these all from the same --

3 MEMBER OF PUBLIC: No.

4 THE FACILITATOR: Have you identified who
5 is who?

6 MEMBER OF PUBLIC: No.

7 THE FACILITATOR: Let's do that. Okay.

8 MEMBER OF PUBLIC: Sure.

9 THE FACILITATOR: What Fred is passing out
10 is the meeting evaluation form, please fill it out.
11 The first question is from Tiffany Sprague.

12 MEMBER OF PUBLIC: Sprague.

13 THE FACILITATOR: "Has the Arizona Game &
14 Fish been consulting regarding wildlife habitat and
15 mitigation efforts. For example, planning for any
16 wildlife proxy requires a multi-year effort to
17 determine the species, attempted crossing locations,
18 and where to place structures, in-depth analysis on
19 appropriate site, etc. Was Game & Fish consulted on
20 multi-functional design based on available
21 information such structures do not work for many
22 species?"

23 MR. SPARGO: Curt, go ahead.

24 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yes, in early, I
25 think it was 2002, 2003, Game & Fish was approached

1 about the opportunity for providing structures on the
2 west end of the South Mountain Preserve area and a
3 meeting was held with FHWA and Game & Fish to talk
4 about the options. It was determined by Game & Fish
5 that the jurisdictional washes there, the corridors,
6 the movement corridors, the obvious locations for
7 multi-functional crossings would best serve wildlife,
8 and -- you can't hear?

9 In 2002, 2003, a meeting was held between
10 FHWA and Arizona Game & Fish Department to discuss
11 the opportunity for placement of wildlife crossings.
12 It was determined that the jurisdictional washes
13 provided the best opportunity, those are movement
14 corridors for a wide variety of wildlife. And it was
15 determined that because of the, let's say, the
16 population densities of wildlife in the area, it was
17 most beneficial on the western side of the South
18 Mountain Preserve to kind of access between the
19 floodplains and the Gila River; as far as the
20 designs, that's something that I think is potentially
21 still on the books to discuss. It was determined
22 that those were the best locations and opportunities
23 for any kind of crossing structures in the project
24 area. And that area has the most impact in terms of
25 lack of development.

1 MEMBER OF PUBLIC: Can I ask a follow-up to
2 that?

3 THE FACILITATOR: Let me get through these.
4 Ariel LeBarron. "Can you look at public
5 transit and transportation more closely to fit the
6 needs of the citizens, both in the South Mountain
7 area, but the Valley as the whole. Use the money for
8 the freeway for this instead. Use examples from the
9 counties and cities to create a working system that
10 in the end could make money for the state." Is that
11 a question or a comment?

12 MEMBER OF PUBLIC: Well, could you use that
13 money for public transportation?

14 THE FACILITATOR: Can they use the money
15 designated here for public transportation? I'm
16 sorry, I didn't get that.

17 MR. SPARGO: Now, the regional
18 transportation plan that was developed in 2004 did
19 include a much more robust public transit portion
20 when compared to what was done in 1985, and that
21 included a lot of local and regional buses, as well
22 as extensions to the light rail, the initial 20-mile
23 segment.

24 So the region has already shown an
25 investment into that system, but along in the

1 RTP there was also a freeway system, which working
2 together to provide, you know, all modes of travel
3 for the community.

4 With regard to the funding itself, there
5 are some firewalls built into the regional
6 transportation plan and it does limit the ability to
7 both use freeway funds for transit projects, as well
8 as to take money from transit projects and use them
9 for freeways.

10 So that would be something that would have
11 to probably be, you know, vetted at the top of MAG.
12 It would be a decision made by them, but there are
13 fire walls built in that would really limit or do not
14 allow the mixing of those funds.

15 THE FACILITATOR: Scott Sprague. "In
16 pre-design meetings for I-11, ADOT representatives
17 have repeatedly stated that no part of the I-11 or
18 scenic drive has been identified beyond a very wide
19 30-mile swath between Phoenix and Las Vegas. Upon
20 approaching Phoenix, ADOT has insisted that many
21 alignments through and around the city are still on
22 the table. This contradicts what the map shows
23 tonight. Please explain the disconnect."

24 MR. SPARGO: Can I have you repeat just the
25 part about where the information was coming from that

1 it's not --

2 THE FACILITATOR: ADOT representatives.

3 MEMBER OF PUBLIC: I can clarify, if you
4 like. In pre-design meetings with the I-11 route,
5 they, ADOT, has provided maps for where they're
6 looking and they purposefully, upon request of a more
7 refined map, they said there's nothing set. This is
8 all that's been decided is this 30-mile swath, and
9 again, I have no, this is just a guess, but there's a
10 swath between Phoenix and Las Vegas and then their
11 map has actually several arrows that spread out at
12 the Vegas end and Phoenix end, and they said even
13 those areas aren't even in consideration at this
14 point or they're pre-designed. That's the next step
15 is entering Phoenix, so I'm just curious, if that's
16 very pertinent to that meeting, so if it's set, it's
17 going to be over there, it's more important to me for
18 that meeting than this meeting.

19 MR. SPARGO: I guess I'm not in tune with
20 all the things going on with I-11 study. I don't
21 know if anybody wants to add anything, but we can
22 follow up after this meeting with more information
23 regarding that, with the I-11 team that's doing that
24 study.

25 THE FACILITATOR: Scott Sprague. "If

1 transit, light rail is truly a priority for the
2 future of the Valley's transportation infrastructure,
3 why was a co-located line not considered as part of
4 this project?"

5 MR. SPARGO: A co-located line, I mean, we
6 do in the Draft EIS discuss the option to co-locate
7 lines. There are some of those that are in the plan
8 today along I-10 west from downtown, as well as the
9 potential for something in around the SR 51 corridor.
10 I think the unique part is that being more of a loop
11 facility, it doesn't facilitate as much for the type
12 of uses that the light rail is, where it's being
13 developed more as a -- more in the spokes from the
14 downtown area.

15 And just like ADOT and MAG do, you know,
16 regional freeway planning and sort of put this system
17 together that works together, you know, Valley Metro
18 and the transit planners have looked at where the
19 best places are based on the density of population,
20 the jobs, and the housing and things like that to put
21 together their plan. And they've identified the
22 corridors that you see in the RTP at this time.
23 Which are more geared towards those other areas and
24 not this area.

25 THE FACILITATOR: Okay. Let's do the

1 follow-up to your question, then I'll wrap up with
2 the last one.

3 Yes, ma'am.

4 MEMBER OF PUBLIC: Okay. Regarding the
5 Game & Fish being approached in 2002 and 2003, have
6 the discussions continued since then, because a lot
7 of information has been learned about appropriate
8 wildlife crossing structures since 2002, and made
9 leaps and bounds of discovery since that time.

10 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Not specifically on
11 that topic, no.

12 MEMBER OF PUBLIC: Okay.

13 THE FACILITATOR: One last question, the
14 others remaining here we either addressed earlier
15 tonight or have been referenced in the EIS, the
16 draft. So we'll put the responses to these on the
17 Internet so we have time for closing. Fair enough?

18 The last question, then, from Scott
19 Sprague, "What about the Tucson Shovelnose Snake?,"
20 is that what it's called, it is another candidate
21 species in the region.

22 MR. SPARGO: Yeah, it is a candidate
23 species, so therefore, as a candidate species
24 therefore it isn't something that has a regulatory
25 requirement, but it will be considered. The initial

1 assessment is that there really is not much
2 appropriate habitat.

3 THE FACILITATOR: Okay. That concludes the
4 open questions from the general public.

5 I'd like to introduce Chaun Hill. And
6 before Chaun comes up or while she's coming up,
7 please keep in mind we do have a quorum and we need
8 to close the meeting out shortly thereafter, but
9 Chaun has a couple comments. I have a closing
10 comments, and then we'll return.

11 CAT MEMBER: I have a question. What are
12 they going to do with these after the meeting?

13 THE FACILITATOR: What are we going to do
14 with the Draft EIS documents after the meeting?

15 MR. SPARGO: We use them at the public
16 hearings, to provide the public an opportunity to
17 look through. We'll have them at the public forums
18 as well. Beyond that, we don't have any.

19 CAT MEMBER: My community has their annual
20 meeting next week and having one of these available
21 would be beneficial.

22 MR. SPARGO: We've made them available for
23 people on the Citizens Advisory Team that have made
24 that request. So if you would like one, just talk to
25 me at the end and we can make that arrangement.

1 MS. HILL: It's my turn?

2 THE FACILITATOR: It's your turn.

3 MS. HILL: I've got to say that I am -- I'd
4 like to introduce myself first. I'm Chaun Hill. I
5 am the project manager for the South Mountain
6 Freeway, and I'm very, very enthusiastic about this
7 project, but what I'd like to say to you all this
8 evening is your dedication to this project and the
9 things you've brought forth to this effort are
10 unprecedented.

11 You have been diligent in your efforts.
12 You've had years and years and years to think about
13 this. You remained vigilant in your positive things
14 that you've brought forth to consider in this overall
15 process, and I just can't say thank you enough for
16 all the dedication and all the things that have
17 really benefited this project overall for your
18 participation.

19 So that's really the bottom line. It's
20 unprecedented to have a committee that's gone this
21 long and really, really made the effort to understand
22 the process, and be involved in the process. You're
23 to be commended immensely and thanked for your
24 participation in this process.

25 So again, I thank you. ADOT thanks you.

1 And I'm sure above all, the communities -- the areas
2 of the community that you represent thank you as
3 well.

4 So thank you for your participation in this
5 process and know that you've really brought forward
6 things that would never have been considered to this
7 depth without your participation. So thanks a lot.

8 THE FACILITATOR: Thank you, Chaun. In our
9 closing remarks as facilitators, I would just echo
10 what Chaun has said. When we first got together to
11 reconstitute the South Mountain Citizens Advisory
12 Team, you might recall that was a bit of disarray at
13 the time. And for the dedication for you to creating
14 an operating agreement, working with each other
15 throughout the process at times when it was very
16 difficult to be civil and to treat each other with
17 respect you chose to do so, and when you look around,
18 whether it's local or state government or certainly
19 at the federal level, at the amount of dysfunction
20 that takes place there, you really are commended for
21 how you worked together.

22 We'll be the first to say that these
23 sessions aren't always perfect, and we don't always
24 get all the information we need or in some cases we
25 don't always like the information we get, but the

1 level of information that you brought is truly
2 appreciated by members of the community, and for
3 those of you who have done all this work so hard
4 representing your organizations, they should be
5 extremely proud of you. I don't even know whether
6 the organizations that you represent know how much
7 time you've put in, not just in these sessions, but
8 in getting ready for these sessions you're to be
9 commended for that, so we thank you very much.

10 At this point I would like to call for a
11 motion to adjourn. And keep in mind this motion is
12 to not only adjourn the meeting, but to end the
13 relationship of the South Mountain Citizens Advisory
14 Team, as you prepare your recommendations. So
15 somebody so move.

16 CAT MEMBER: I make a motion.

17 THE FACILITATOR: State your motion.

18 CAT MEMBER: I make a motion to adjourn.

19 THE FACILITATOR: And?

20 CAT MEMBER: And move forward -- what is
21 that?

22 CAT MEMBER: And dissolve this committee.

23 THE FACILITATOR: We have met the purpose.
24 Do we have a second?

25 CAT MEMBER: Second.

1 THE FACILITATOR: All in favor, aye.

2 Opposed?

3 CAT MEMBERS: "Aye."

4 THE FACILITATOR: We are adjourned. Thank
5 you very much.

6 (Proceedings concluded at 8:34 p.m.)

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 STATE OF ARIZONA)
COUNTY OF MARICOPA)

2

3

CERTIFICATE

4

I, ROBIN L. B. OSTERODE, Certified

5

Reporter for the State of Arizona and Certified

6

Shorthand Reporter for the State of California

7

certify:

8

That the foregoing proceeding was taken

9

by me in shorthand and thereafter reduced to print by

10

computer-aided transcription under my direction; that

11

the foregoing pages are a full, true, and accurate

12

transcript of all proceedings, to the best of my

13

skill and ability.

14

I FURTHER CERTIFY that I am in no way

15

related to nor employed by any of the parties hereto,

16

nor am I in any way interested in the outcome hereof.

17

DATED this 19th day of June, 2013.

18

19

ROBIN L. B. OSTERODE, RPR

20

CA CSR No. 7750

AZ CR No. 50695

21

22

23

24

25